

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY 1944

1. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

2. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

3. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

4. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

5. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

6. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

7. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

8. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

9. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

10. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

11. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

12. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

13. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

14. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

15. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

16. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

17. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

18. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

19. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.

20. THE NEW FRONT IN EUROPE
by Sir John Simon, Bt.



FINE ART PHOTOGRAPHS

High-grade photographic prints of models of all ages.

We offer these valuable prints to artists and students as an aid to their work in figure construction, composition and design.

Send stamp for particulars of the very useful range of Model Poses now available.

Kindly state profession or age when writing.

K. R. LEON PUBLISHING CO.

792, Harrow Road,
London, N.W.10

HEFFER'S



**A CAMBRIDGE
BOOKSHOP
THAT IS
KNOWN
IN ALL PARTS
OF THE WORLD**

W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.
Petty Cury, Cambridge

THE CHURCH ARMY

FIGHT THE  GOOD FIGHT

has done, is doing and will do a wide-spread work for God and the people

**NEW FRIENDS
AND WORKERS
are wanted**

**Will YOU enrol
as a friend of
The Church Army?**

Kindly post this form to The Rev. E. Wilson Carlile, General Secretary, Church Army, 55 Bryanston Street, London, W.1. A Card of Membership will be sent as soon as possible; and literature will be forwarded from time to time.

I would like to associate myself with the work of the Church Army and to be enrolled as a friend. I promise to subscribe not less than 10s. a year and to pray regularly for the work and the workers.

NAME

ADDRESS

"The best of our literary magazines"
—*The Spectator*

THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE

has long been one of the finest mediums
through which the discerning reader may
keep in touch with the best in modern
English literary trends

*The current Summer Number
includes*

A CONTEST OF LADIES

Short Story

William Sansom

NATURAL HISTORY IN ARCADIA

Morchard Bishop

THE TOWER OF THE FOUR WINDS

Short Story

Peter Matthiessen

HALF OF THEIR LIVES

Some Notes on the Victorian Mountaineers

Ronald W. Clark

MAGNIFICAT

A Poem

Katharine Garvin

THE MASS MIND

Joyce Cary

*An ideal gift for 2s. 6d. Subscription for four issues
10s. 8d. (including postage)*

JOHN MURRAY

BYRON, SHELLEY and their PISAN CIRCLE

Professor C. L. CLINE

"The Byron expert will find much in this book to add to his knowledge and to correct his previous assumptions. The ordinary reader will welcome it as a vivid picture of a remarkable set of men and women. Mr. Cline has an excellent gift of narrative."—Harold Nicolson in the *Observer*.

"Professor Cline's enchanting book affords a living picture of daily and literary life at Pisa. It is strictly factual and thoroughly well documented."—*Liverpool Daily Post*.

Illustrated.

25s. net.

OMAR KHAYYÁM

*A New Version Based upon
Recent Discoveries*

Professor A. J. ARBERRY, Litt.D.

"Professor Arberry has chosen for his rendering the metre of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*. This was a daring and successful choice. He handles those slow sequences with skill and gaiety; his metre rings out as a carillon rather than as a dirge. I fear that those who read Professor Arberry's fine translation will regret the lilt of Fitzgerald's paraphrase. But it is helpful to dispel illusions."—Harold Nicolson in the *Spectator*.

15s. net.

—JOHN MURRAY—

"IT'S TOO LATE NOW . . .

but when he asked me to be one of his executors I didn't like to refuse; I ought to have known this was no job for the amateur. I had no idea what complications and difficulties could arise for the executor of a comparatively simple will and so I've taken good care my friends don't have this job to do for me. The Norwich Union will be my Executor; their fees are extremely low—only 4/- per £100 of the gross estate, with a minimum fee of £15.



Norwich Union
INSURANCE SOCIETIES
6-12 SURREY ST., NORWICH

Why don't you send
for the booklet which
tells you all about it?"

IMPERIAL CANCER RESEARCH FUND

Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1939.

President : The Rt. Hon. THE EARL OF HALIFAX, K.G., P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

Chairman of Council : Professor H. R. DEAN, M.D., F.R.C.P.

Hon. Treasurer : Sir HOLBURT WARING, Bt., C.B.E., F.R.C.S.

Director : Dr. JAMES CRAIGIE, O.B.E., F.R.S.

The Fund was founded in 1902 under the direction of the Royal College of Physicians of London and the Royal College of Surgeons of England and is governed by representatives of many medical and scientific institutions. It is a centre for research and information on Cancer and carries on continuous and systematic investigations in up-to-date laboratories at Mill Hill. Our knowledge has so increased that the disease is now curable in ever greater numbers.

LEGACIES, DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS are urgently needed for the maintenance and extension of our work.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Honorary Treasurer, Sir Holburt Waring, Bt. at Royal College of Surgeons, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.2.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby bequeath the sum of £_____ to the Imperial Cancer Research Fund (Treasurer, Sir Holburt Waring, Bt.) at Royal College of Surgeons of England, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.2, for the purpose of Scientific Research, and I direct that the Treasurer's receipt shall be a good discharge for such legacy.

**THE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW**

No. 593.

**PUBLISHED IN
JULY 1952.**

**LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.
1952**

Pioneers of Social Service

In developing William Booth's "In Darkest England" social service scheme, The Salvation Army has pioneered and expanded innumerable benevolent activities—so successfully that they have inspired much of present day State welfare work.

A great deal remains to be done: new plans must be put into operation, existing activities must be maintained. In this work of selfless devotion, The Salvation Army depends upon individual generosity. Donations and bequests are earnestly sought. Please send a gift to General Albert Orsborn, 101, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4.

Some Salvation Army Steps in Social Welfare

- 1884 Prison-gate homes for the regeneration of criminals.
- 1901 The first Children's Home opened for the maladjusted and neglected.
- 1910 The first Eventide Home for the aged established.
- 1913 The Mothers' Hospital opened at Clapton.
- 1926 Reconciliation Bureau set up to advise and help estranged families.
- 1948 Mayflower Training Home for neglectful mothers opened, the first of its kind.



WHERE THERE'S NEED—

The Salvation Army

Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES & SONS, Limited, London and Beccles
and published by JOHN MURRAY (Publishers) Limited

CONTENTS

OF

No. 593.—JULY 1952.

ART.	PAGE
1. THE STRATEGIC ELEMENT IN MODERN DIPLOMACY. By Sir Charles Petrie, Bt - - - - -	289
2. THE 1951 HOUSE OF COMMONS. By J. F. S. Ross, M.C., Ph.D. - - - - -	301
3. THE FESTIVAL OF BRITAIN AND THE 'MESS OF CENTURIES.' By Sir Ernest Benn, Bt, C.B.E. -	315
4. THE CASE AGAINST ALCOHOL-DRINKING. By R. F. Rattray, Ph.D. - - - - -	329
5. SCOTT'S KNOWLEDGE OF SHAKESPEARE. By W. M. Parker - - - - -	341
6. FROM CRADLE TO GRAVE. By Daisy L. Hobman -	355
7. THE RELATION BETWEEN ETHICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE. By Ronald Fletcher - - - -	365
8. THE TIED COTTAGE. By Norman Goodland -	379
9. PRIVATELY OWNED WOODLANDS—YESTERDAY, TO- DAY, AND TO-MORROW. By Sir Richard Proby, Bt, M.C. - - - - -	391
10. CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND. By Rev. B. M. G. Reardon - - - - -	405
SOME RECENT BOOKS - - - - -	417

Lord Randolph Churchill—The Victorian Temper—Russia Absent and Present—The Making of France—Power Politics—The Forging of a Family—Community Farm—The Great Philosophers: The Eastern World—The Beauty of Old Trains—How the Civil Service Works—The Confident Years, 1885-1915—The Story of Language—Beginning in Archaeology—The Last Serjeant—The Sensations, Their Functions, Processes and Mechanisms—Poems 1914-1950—The World of Learning, 1952.

CONTENTS

No. 591.—JANUARY 1952.

1. The Passing of the Indian States: I	1
2. Trieste: Italy's Touchstone	17
3. Many-sided Insurance	30
4. An Indictment of Leftism	45
5. Islam and the Middle East	56
6. The Products of our Schools	68
7. Pétain	79
8. The Economic Situation in Australia	91
9. London's Festival	105
10. The Stockbroker Author	121
Some Recent Books	135

No. 592—APRIL 1952

1. The Challenge to Conservatism	145
2. European Federation—The Need for Realism	156
3. The Last Phase of the Indian States: II	164
4. A Wool Town in the Cotswolds—Cirencester	176
5. Lord Perth	187
6. Racial Stresses in Southern Africa	197
7. The Poetry of Sir Walter Scott	211
8. Profits and Taxation	226
9. Murder and Capital Punishment	238
10. Keats and the Limitations of Pantheism	252
11. The Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	262
Vale et Ave!	277
Some Recent Books	278

✚ THE QUARTERLY REVIEW is published in January, April,
July, and October.

Price Thirty-five Shillings and Sixpence per Annum, *post free*.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 593.—JULY 1952

Art. 1.—THE STRATEGIC ELEMENT IN MODERN DIPLOMACY.

THE study of diplomacy has a long and respectable ancestry, and the subject has in the main been competently handled by the leading historians of modern times. There are also a number of admirable works in various languages dealing with strategy, though it must be confessed that these are usually directed to a narrow and specialised class of reader. On the other hand, it is extremely rare, at any rate in England, to find a civil historian who can write intelligibly about military matters, or a soldier who takes into account the diplomatic considerations which influenced any particular campaign. The ignorance of the average historian regarding the barest elements of strategy has to be read to be believed, while it is not infrequently extremely difficult to discover from the pages of the military writers what was the reason for the fighting they describe. In effect, diplomacy and strategy have too often been regarded separately, with the result that the real lessons of the past have been ignored or misinterpreted.

This is the more extraordinary in view of the fact that the foreign policy of a country is primarily dictated by its position on the map. A revolution, like a flood, may for a time seem to obliterate the old familiar features, but ere long they reappear, though possibly in a slightly different form. No nation can change its geographical position, its climate, or its economic resources, and it is upon these that its foreign policy must in the long run be based: what can and does change is the ability to put this policy into execution. Nineteenth-century France affords an excellent example of this. From the restoration of the Bourbons on the morrow of Waterloo until the overthrow of Napoleon III at Sedan, that is to say in the space of

Vol. 290.—No. 593.

less than two generations, she was governed by two different types of monarchy, one empire which was really a dictatorship, and one republic. Nevertheless, these attempts to achieve the ideal in the matter of government had little effect upon French foreign policy, which continued to be governed by traditional influences and by the relative position of France in the world. It was not the repeated revolutions in which she indulged in the nineteenth century that affected the achievements of France in the field of foreign affairs, but her exhaustion after the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.

Strategy, too, is largely based on these same factors of geography, economics, and climate, so that it is in no way surprising that the connection between diplomacy and strategy should be close, even if the fact is not always appreciated. Of course other considerations have also to be taken into account, and not the least important of these is the progress of scientific discovery, which has caused many modifications both in strategy and diplomacy. In any examination of the problem, therefore, one must recognise that it falls into two periods: the first of these relates to the era before the coming of the submarine and the aeroplane, and the second to that after their advent.

The history of the United States affords an excellent example of the close connection between diplomacy and strategy. The purchase of Louisiana from France in 1803 and of Florida from Spain sixteen years later removed two of her most serious dangers on the American continent itself, and by the middle of the nineteenth century she had by the sword, by cash, and by migration put into execution the 'manifest destiny' idea of territorial expansion to the Pacific. It was a policy in all ways comparable with that being contemporaneously pursued by the European Powers, but its full implications were hidden from the majority of American citizens because these territorial acquisitions were on their own continent, and in consequence they came to imagine that their expansion was less reprehensible than that of other nations. In reality there was nothing to choose, and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico, in February 1848, was simply the application in the New World of the principles which had governed the partitions of Poland in the Old. Where the United States

had the advantage over the European Powers in its policy of expansion at the expense of a weaker neighbour was that it was safe from interference by the outside world. The Monroe Doctrine was little more than an idle threat at the time it was promulgated, but the British Navy was a real force, and as soon as Canning had proved to the Holy Alliance that it would not be allowed to extend its activities to the Americas, the United States could do what it liked on its own continent provided that it left Canada alone. The only Power that could have prevented her expansion was Great Britain, and the British Government made no effort to do so.

For all practical purposes this state of affairs lasted until the outbreak of the First World War. Its strategic situation made it possible for Washington to pursue a policy of isolation in the other continents and of expansion in its own. One further example will suffice. The Suez Canal has been a vital factor in the politics of the British Empire ever since it was opened, but the control of it has been a perpetual source of friction between Great Britain and other nations, not least with Egypt herself. The Panama Canal is of equal importance to the United States, and when Colombia refused to agree to the American demands a revolution was engineered in the State of Panama, its secession from Colombia was duly recognised, and the new republic ceded to Washington the required rights over the Panama Canal. The rest of the world may have had some qualms as to the morality of these proceedings, but it was unable to give them concrete expression.

The history of England at the same time points the same moral. So long as she retained command of the sea she was safe from attack, and she could base her foreign policy upon that strategic assumption. She could ally herself with a Continental Power, or she could withdraw into splendid isolation, equally in the full assurance that if anything went wrong she was impregnable in her island fortress. She made innumerable unsuccessful assaults on the mainland at various points from Walcheren to Cadiz, but she could always get her troops away again: there was never any fear that a defeated English army would be followed to London by the victorious enemy. The coming of steam even strengthened her position in this respect, for

in the days of sail there was always the chance that the wind might at a critical moment keep the British Navy in port and open the Channel to an invader, as had happened in the case of William of Orange: until the submarine made its appearance the steamship rendered invasion impossible in any circumstance, and it is no mere coincidence that this period of complete immunity from attack should have coincided with the adoption of the policy of 'splendid isolation.'

That this conception was by no means unsound was proved at the time of the Fashoda crisis in 1898. The French army was immeasurably superior to the British, but there was no method of bringing this force to bear. Had France decided to fight, her naval weakness would have entailed the loss of her overseas possessions without her land forces being able to strike a blow in return. When Napoleon lay at Boulogne in the opening years of the nineteenth century there was always a chance that a change of wind might immobilise the British fleet and enable him to cross the twenty-six miles of water which separated him from his objective, but, as we have seen, by 1898 the coming of steam had necessitated the abandonment of any such hope. Therefore France had to give way, and Marchand was ordered to evacuate Fashoda.

The fact is that down the ages France has, for geographical reasons, never enjoyed that position of security which was for so long the happy lot of Great Britain and the United States. She has always been highly vulnerable in one direction or another, and her enemies have consequently been able to take full advantage of any internal weakness which she might develop. Without going any further back than the sixteenth century, the Religious Wars were utilised by the Habsburgs to construct a ring round France which it took all the efforts of Richelieu and Louis XIV to break; later, the chaos caused by the French Revolution soon led to the presence of foreign troops on French soil. Such being the case it is not surprising that the rulers of France should so often have passed, without noticing it, the point at which the defence of their own country became aggression against their neighbours. It was in quest of the security of France that French troops fought at the Boyne and that Napoleon went to Moscow. It is one of the ironies of history that

this quest for security should have been one of the principal factors in the unification of Germany which was to put that security in greater peril than ever.

The influence of this strategic vulnerability upon the diplomacy of France is evident on every page of her history. To counteract it she has always endeavoured to have a friend in the rear of her most dangerous enemy so that if war came that enemy would be compelled to fight on two fronts. In respect of England, the 'auld alliance' with the Scots long served this purpose; so far as the Holy Roman Empire was concerned the purpose was served by the maintenance of close relations with Sweden, Poland, and Turkey; and after the First World War it was for long hoped at the Quai d'Orsay that any revival of the German menace would be checked by an understanding with the Little Entente.

To pass to Germany is to come to a country which has no natural frontiers, and ever since its unification the foreign policy of its rulers has been directed towards remedying this strategic weakness. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that since 1870 strategy and diplomacy have been almost interchangeable terms where Germany is concerned. The whole policy of Bismarck was to exorcise the spectre of a war on two fronts, and while he was at the helm this was avoided, but when lesser men took his place the danger became acute once more, and in due course Germany went down to disaster. To a lesser extent the same considerations operate in respect of Russia, but with the difference that Germany has been successfully invaded on numerous occasions, while the very size of Russia has defeated all would-be conquerors in modern times. She also has no natural frontiers, but in the past this has not been of the first importance: just as the English could withdraw into their island fortress and sally out again in due course whenever they pleased, so could the Russian retreat into the steppes, and when it suited him issue forth again into Poland, the Balkans, Central Asia, or the Far East; only when his armies were outside their own country were they vulnerable.

It is, of course, important to bear in mind that throughout this period the object of war was not to exterminate an opponent, but to make him change his policy: when this goal had been achieved the war came to an end. Thus

strategy and diplomacy went hand-in-hand. The modern theory, so often propounded during the Second World War, that nothing matters except winning the war that happens to be in progress would not have been understood by our ancestors, which possibly explains why the treaties they made were in the main more durable and more satisfactory. To them a war was not an end in itself, but a means to securing a settlement other than that which existed before hostilities began. As for total war, their weapons did not allow them to wage it, and in any event they would assuredly have shrunk from pushing their quarrels to such extremes. When, for instance, in the height of a war between France and England, a French privateer carried off the men from Eddystone Lighthouse, Louis XIV indignantly ordered them to be taken back, remarking, 'I am making war on England, not on humanity.' In the eighteenth century there was, too, what may perhaps be termed a close season for campaigning during the winter months, and as often as not this period was utilised by the belligerents to discover if peace was possible, the basis of the negotiations being the results of the fighting during the previous months.

This was, too, the heyday of the Balance of Power, and the very term implies the close connection which existed between strategy and diplomacy. For ninety-nine years, that is to say from the battle of Waterloo to the outbreak of the First World War, no conflict involved more than two or three of the Great Powers: there were always a number of neutrals to whose interests the belligerents had to pay the closest attention for fear that they would throw in their lot with one or other set of combatants, and this had the most profound effect upon strategy right down to 1914. In the Crimean War the potential strength of Russia in man-power was considerably greater than anything that Great Britain or France could bring against her, but it could never be developed where it was most required, namely for the relief of Sebastopol, owing to the necessity of keeping large forces on the western frontiers in case Austria, and to a lesser degree Prussia, should throw in her lot with the Tsar's enemies. It was to this cause, as much as to any other, that the Anglo-French victory was due.

The doctrine and practice of the Balance of Power on

very many occasions limited both the scope and the ferocity of war. It was owing to the fear of British intervention that the neutrality of Belgium was respected in 1870, and as late as 1911 the Concert of Europe intimated to both parties in the Turco-Italian War that hostilities must be confined to a certain specified area, and that they would not be allowed to carry on their campaign indiscriminately all over the Mediterranean: in particular, the Sultan was prevented from sending reinforcements to Tripoli by way of Egypt, and the Italians were not permitted to blockade the Dardanelles. This limitation of the extent and intensity of war had the further beneficial result that it rendered peace more easily attainable, and as matters had not been pushed to extremes the settlement was usually along moderate lines.

Such was the situation before the arrival of the submarine and the aeroplane, inventions which have had as profound an influence upon strategy and diplomacy as the use of the stirrup and the employment of gunpowder. It was, indeed, some time before their full significance and implications were realised, but the doom of the older order was foreshadowed when the first submarine with electric motors took the water in 1898, and when Bleriot flew the Channel in 1909, just as surely as the future of the railways was placed in ultimate jeopardy by the first motor-car that was put on the road. To gauge the full effect of this revolution in warfare, for it was nothing less, it will be well to examine the changed position in the world of the Powers whose policy in the preceding era has already been discussed.

Perhaps the most remarkable transformation that has ever come over the attitude of a nation towards foreign affairs in little more than a generation has occurred in the case of the United States, and this is almost entirely due to strategic considerations. Until the First World War she was on the way to becoming a World Power without realising, or even desiring, the development that was taking place. In consequence, each step forward had been followed by a recoil, and what proved to be the last relapse into isolation following the Presidential election of 1920 was but a natural development in view of what had gone before. It is true that an increasing number of leaders of opinion realised that conditions were changing, and that they

were passing into an age when war might come to America whether her people liked it or not, but the fact was not generally appreciated. Then, on Dec. 7, 1941, came the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour, and the Americans suddenly found themselves the laughing-stock of the world. To quote Major-General J. F. C. Fuller: 'Like Adam and Eve, the Americans discovered that they were naked; their eyes were most unexpectedly opened, and they suddenly realised that they had been living in a fool's paradise of their own making. That though, nearly five months before, they had declared an economic war on Japan, which, in the circumstances she was placed in, inevitably must lead to an armed conflict, they had been so lacking in imagination that like a greenhorn they had been thimble-rigged.'

The effect of this attack can be estimated by a comparison between the old isolationist attitude and that of collaboration which has existed since the end of the Second World War. A European who had gone to sleep in 1932 and who only woke up twenty years later would hardly believe what he saw. American ships-of-war on all the seas; American troops fighting on the mainland of Asia and in garrison in the centre of Europe; and at home in the United States an armaments programme of fantastic proportions. The possibility of invasion, which the experts say cannot be wholly ruled out, has effected this transformation, and has given rise to a foreign policy of which the main object is to ensure that if there is a Third World War it shall be fought as far from the United States as possible. In this desire she is, as we shall see shortly, by no means unique, and the range of modern weapons renders it desirable to have the enemy bases very far away indeed; what is remarkable is that Americans should be thinking along these lines at all. There can be few instances in history where a development in the department of strategy has effected so revolutionary a change in the foreign policy of a country.

Upon Great Britain and her position in the world the appearance of these new weapons had a catastrophic effect, for from being to all intents and purposes inaccessible the British Isles were transformed into the most vulnerable target in the world. If it is fear of what may happen that is influencing opinion in the United States, it

is experience of what has happened that is operating in the same way in Great Britain. It was the submarine that first made itself felt, and in the spring of 1917 it came within an ace of giving Germany the victory in the First World War. The aeroplane in that conflict was not a very serious menace to life in the British Isles, though it was already recognised as one of the greatest threats of the future. In the thirties Mr Baldwin declared that England's frontier was the Rhine, but when war came again in 1939 that frontier proved to be the ordinary Englishman's roof. Disaster was averted only by the incompetence displayed by the Germans when they possessed command of the air, and by the fact that the perfection of the guided missile was delayed until it was, owing to the progress of hostilities, too late to use it with the maximum effect.

Thus the capacity of Great Britain to pursue a policy of isolation, splendid or otherwise, is at an end, and she no longer enjoys the immunity from attack which was hers for the best part of two centuries. Englishmen, in short, no longer go to war, it is war that comes to them. Nor is this all, for the large population which fifty years ago was her pride has now become a serious liability: it has to be fed along sea-routes which are exposed to hostile submarines and aircraft, and it has to be defended at home against piloted planes, guided missiles, and other horrors from the air. If anything goes wrong this swollen population will in a very short space find itself hungry and in a large measure unemployed. It is true that there is still the English Channel, but from being the unbridgeable gulf which it was at the end of the nineteenth century it is now little more than a first-rate tank trap.

In consequence many an old theory of foreign policy has had to go by the board. If a dispute arose in any part of the world the third Marquess of Salisbury and his colleagues at the turn of the century could decide to what extent, if at all, their country should intervene, without a thought to any threat to the British Isles; but in less than two generations this threat has become the preoccupation of every Foreign Secretary. Therefore it is now a guiding principle of policy that wars must be fought as far from Great Britain as possible, and the Elbe, not the Rhine, is the only satisfactory alternative to John Bull's own roof. Another result of the use of the new weapons has been that

the robust bellicosity of the electorate has given place to a nervous pacifism, as was clearly demonstrated at the recent General Election.

For Germany the change has proved in two wars to be definitely beneficial in their earlier stages, and this will always be the case when Britain is among her enemies, though if this latter factor ceases to operate then it is not easy to see how either the submarine or any new aerial weapon would be much use to her against any other foe. To a France in alliance with Britain the same observation applies: she could not be brought to her knees by a submarine blockade, and if she is too weak to defend herself against land attack the danger from the air is merely a more immediate threat—a difference of hours rather than of days, that is all.

The position of Russia, on the other hand, has been weakened in the same way as that of Great Britain, and for the same reason. There is now no need for her enemies to court the fate of Charles XII, of Napoleon, and of Hitler by invading the country; aerial attack in one form or another can paralyse her, more particularly since the industrialisation of recent years has rendered her a great deal more vulnerable than was the case in the past. In this connection the oilfields in the Caucasus and to a lesser extent those in Rumania can certainly not be ignored. The effect of this weakening of her strategic situation has not been lost upon the rulers of Russia, and their resulting activity in the diplomatic field has been considerable. Like their British counterparts they have decided that if war comes again it shall be fought as far from their own country as possible, or at any rate that enemy bases either for piloted planes or guided missiles shall not be easily accessible to their frontiers. This is the reason for the ring of satellite states with which Russia has surrounded herself during the past seven years: they are not primarily to serve as an ideological *cordon sanitaire*, but rather as advance posts to keep the enemy at a distance.

Thus there are two groups of powers, the United States and Great Britain on the one side and Russia on the other, which have lost their previous security as a result of the development of new weapons, and they are endeavouring by diplomatic action to regain that security, or at any rate something approaching it, in the altered circumstances of

to-day. In Europe, in Central Asia, and in the Far East the clash that is taking place between the two groups is largely occasioned by their respective desire to push each other back for the reasons already mentioned.

The problem of Europe is really the problem of Germany. Behind the expressed desire of the Western Powers for a united Reich, which in many ways is diametrically opposed to their own interests, is the hope that it would be Russophobe, and that it would thus lie between them and the potential enemy. For precisely the same strategic reason the Kremlin hopes that a united Germany would be Russophil, and would become another satellite. As for the Germans themselves, what they would clearly and quite naturally like would be to become once again strong enough to play their neighbours to the East and West off against one another. Of one thing there can be no question, and it is that Russia will not lightly relax her hold on the states along her border which she has brought under her control.

In Central Asia the situation is less tense, partly because the distances are very much greater even when judged by modern standards, and partly because the British are no longer in India, there is no threat to Russian security from that quarter: Nehru is probably regarded in Moscow as an Indian Benes. Great Britain and the United States are so weak in this area, more particularly since the recent developments in Persia, that it has been possible to transfer a part of Russian industry to the east of the Urals apparently without seriously taking into account the risk of attack from the air.

Much more activity prevails in the Far East, and much more is at stake. If a really independent Korea is an impossibility, then the country will constitute a threat either to Vladivostok or to Japan, and that is why there is a war going on there to-day. For the moment Russia and China are allies, if somewhat uneasy ones, because they have in common that they are, or they consider themselves to be, menaced by the United States. They will not feel really safe until the islands off the coast of Asia, including Japan itself, are under their control: equally the Americans believe it is only by holding on to these places that they can make the United States reasonably safe from attack.

We have thus arrived in the middle of the twentieth century at a situation in which the diplomacy of the Great Powers is directed towards securing distant bases for the purpose of keeping any future war well away from their home territory. For a long time it has been said that the world was getting smaller; the coming of these new weapons has made it very small indeed. Two hundred years ago there was room and to spare for Louis XV at Versailles, for Nadir Shah at Ispahan, and for Chien-lung at Peking, but to-day any move anywhere is regarded with disquiet everywhere else. In these circumstances the danger lies in a struggle, not on ideological grounds, which are much over-rated as a cause of war; not even for markets or access to raw materials, though these are disturbing factors; but rather for these advance bases, as has been seen in the case of Korea, and may any day be seen a good deal nearer home.

In fine, strategy and diplomacy have rarely been as closely connected as they are at the present time, and the fact would be less alarming if it were more widely appreciated. More people than ever before are living in a world which is shrinking before their eyes, and the solution of the problem is assuredly not a race for superiority in the latest weapons. Present Wilson's famous dictum about making the world safe for democracy was well commented on by the wit who suggested that it was first of all necessary to make democracy safe for the world. The same is surely true of the new weapons: they must be made safe for mankind, and that is the task of diplomacy.

CHARLES PETRIE.

Art. 2.—THE 1951 HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THERE seems to be a fairly widespread impression that the General Election of October 1951 found the electorate comparatively apathetic. That is an illusion. Just on 82.8 per cent. of the electors on the register went to the poll, which is pretty good, especially as the register used was nearly a year out of date. Compiled in November 1950, this register must at the time of the election have included some half-million or so of electors who had died in the intervening eleven months. It is true that at the preceding election, that of February 1950, there was an even higher poll, reaching nearly 84.0 per cent. of the electorate ; but that was unusually high. Moreover, in 1951 there were far fewer candidates than in 1950, and therefore less choice ; and that makes inevitably for a lower poll. It should be noted also that in 1945—when the keenness of the electors was taken for granted—only 76.0 per cent. voted. So, proportionately, for every 11 electors who went to the poll in 1945, 12 went in 1951.

This election was unique in one respect : it brought in only 46 new members—a remarkably low figure. Previously the lowest number of new members entering the House at any general election (at least within the last forty years) was the 79 of 1935. The 1945 election brought in 324, and that of 1950 introduced 130, while the inter-war average was 186. No doubt the fact that it was less than two years since the previous election had something to do with it ; but it may be noted that the 1923 election, though it took place only thirteen months after that of 1922, yet brought in 159 new members ; while ten months later the election of 1924—the third in less than two years—introduced another 133. In actual fact this small proportion of new blood entering in 1951 seems to be one of a number of signs of the rigidity that has set in in our electoral and parliamentary system.

This rigidity is also displayed in the fact that, as in 1950, not one single Independent member of any sort or kind—left, right, or centre—was returned to Parliament, nor any member of a minor party (except, of course, the two Irish Nationalists from Ulster). How serious a breach with tradition this involves few seem to know or care. Moreover, the already greatly reduced Liberal Party

suffered a further diminution, its numbers falling from nine to six. Hence all but eight of the 625 members of the new parliament are definitely committed to either the Conservative Party or the Labour Party; and, at the present rate, it will soon be impossible for anyone who is neither a Tory nor a Socialist to secure election to the House which is supposed to represent the whole nation. Further, a candidate, even if he is in general agreement with one or other of these two parties, will stand little chance of success unless he is acceptable to Abbey House on the one hand or to Transport House on the other. The two party headquarters will then be in a position—they are almost there now—to exclude from parliament any man or woman who shows any inconvenient independence of thought or action, even within their own parties. This is something new in British politics, and it is, I suggest, a highly undesirable development, quite alien to our long political traditions. We need a new Burke to vindicate the freedom of the House of Commons: this time not against the encroachments of the 'King's friends' but against those of the party machines.

Leaving that aside, let us examine the make-up of the new House. Of the 625 members elected in 1950, all but 73 were re-elected in 1951. The vanished 73 disappeared for the following reasons: 9 had died, 3 had become peers, one had been disqualified, and 6 had resigned on account of ill-health or for other personal reasons. Of the remaining 54, 29 did not seek re-election and 25 were defeated. To fill the places of the 73, there were 7 new members returned at by-elections, while the General Election brought back 20 pre-1950 members and introduced 46 brand-new members: 32 Conservatives, 12 Labour, one Liberal, and one Irish Nationalist.*

AGES OF MEMBERS

The number of new members being so small, any averages given in relation to them must be used with caution, since they are not statistically very significant. However, for what they are worth, here are the average ages of the

* Throughout this article 'Conservatives' includes all who, under whatever alias, are supported by, and support, the Conservative Party; and similarly 'Labour' includes 'Co-operative.'

new members: Conservatives, 41 years 4½ months; Labour, 43 years 0½ month; all parties together, 41 years 8½ months. The 'old' members—i.e. those who had sat in the House at any time before October 1951—were, of course, far more numerous. Their average ages at this election come out as follows: Conservatives, 48 years 11 months; Labour, 52 years 10½ months; all parties together, 50 years 11 months.

For all members, new and old together, the average ages work out as follows. The 321 Conservatives averaged 48 years 2 months, against 47 years 7 months for the Conservatives returned in the 1950 election: an increase of seven months. The 296 Labour members averaged 52 years 5½ months, against an average of 51 years 8 months in 1950: an increase of 9½ months. Hence the average Labour M.P. in the new House is 4 years 3½ months older than the average Conservative: an increase of 2½ months over the corresponding figure for the 1950 House. Taken as a whole, the present House had an average age of 50 years 3 months on election, compared with the 49 years 8½ months of the House elected in February 1950. This makes the present House slightly older than the average for the seven inter-war Houses.

The youngest new member was a Labour man aged 27 years 11 months, while the oldest was a Conservative aged 60 years 6 months. Of the 'old' members, the youngest was a Labour man of 26 years 6 months, while the oldest, also Labour, was 78 years 11 months. The extreme difference of members' ages was therefore 52 years 5 months—well over half a century between the youngest member and the oldest.

Dividing members into four equal age-ranges, each of 15 years, we find that the youngest of these ranges (21 to 36 years) only contains 7½ per cent. of the members, while the next (36 to 51 years) contains 49 per cent. of them, or very nearly half the House. The third range (51 to 66 years) contains 35 per cent. of the members, and the oldest (66 to 81 years) contains only 8½ per cent.

PREVIOUS SERVICE

This new House, as already noted, is remarkable for its record low number of new members: only 46, as against

130 in 1950 and 324 in 1945. So it is not surprising to find that the average length of previous service of its members is, with that of the 1935 House, the highest on record for a new House (at least within the last forty years), viz. 8 years 1 month. The corresponding figures for 1950 and 1945 were 7 years 4 months and 5 years 4 months respectively.

Here it may be noted that Lord Winterton has been succeeded as 'Father of the House' by Sir Hugh O'Neill. Lord Winterton had nearly forty-seven years of continuous membership to his credit when he retired from the House last October, having first entered parliament in November 1904. Sir Hugh O'Neill succeeds him as 'Father' with 36 years 8 months of continuous service on record, having first won his seat in February 1915.

But the Prime Minister, Mr Churchill, has seen more service in the House of Commons than either Lord Winterton or Sir Hugh O'Neill, for he entered this new 1951 parliament with no less than forty-nine years of such service behind him. But for the two short interruptions in his service, he would easily have been 'Father of the House' as well as Premier. Perhaps even more remarkable is the extent to which the Prime Minister's parliamentary memory exceeds that of his colleagues. He first became an M.P. in October 1900, while Victoria was still on the throne, whereas Mr Attlee only came in in November 1922—more than twenty-two years later. Indeed, Mr Churchill is the only member left who was in the House before the 1914-18 war; and he had been in it nearly fourteen years when that war broke out. Sir Hugh O'Neill came in during that war, but none of the other 623 members of the present House of Commons entered it until after the war was over. Indeed, strange as it may seem, there are now only six survivors in the House of the one elected, after the war, in December 1918.

SCHOOL EDUCATION

For reasons explained elsewhere,* the school education of members of parliament can best be dealt with in accord-

* See my 'Parliamentary Representation' (1943), p. 41, or my article on 'The 1950 House of Commons' in the 'Quarterly Review' for July 1951.

ance with the threefold classification of Public School, Secondary (selective) School, and Elementary School. On these lines, and assuming that the small minority of M.Ps. whose schools are unknown received *pro rata* the same kinds of schooling as the bulk of their own parties did, the members of the 1951 House of Commons received their school education as follows :

	Cons.	Lab.	Others	Total
Public . . .	264	67	3	334
Secondary . . .	47	77	4	128
Elementary . . .	10	152	1	163
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total . . .	321	296	8	625
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Compared with 1950, the new House has nine more public-school members, two less from secondary schools, and seven less from elementary schools. This, of course, reflects the Conservative gain of seats from Labour. Within each party there is no significant change in the distribution of its members amongst the three types of school.

Eton can claim 81 members of the new House, and Harrow 24, against 84 and 21 respectively in the previous House. But these small variations are probably nothing more than the inevitable fluctuations due to chance. The only other schools to reach double figures are Winchester with 13 M.Ps. to its credit, Haileybury with 12, and Marlborough with 11. Once again, Eton has an unchallengeable position, with more of its old pupils in the House of Commons than the next six schools on the list—Harrow, Winchester, Haileybury, Marlborough, Rugby, and Charterhouse—together.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

The number of members who claim some sort of university education—not always covering a full course, or resulting in the award of a degree—continues to grow. In the new House it is 51 per cent. of the membership, a proportion previously attained only in 1931. But in 1931 there was an enormous Conservative majority, against the very small one in 1951. So there is really a new record

in this respect, and this is borne out by the following figures :

	1951	1950	1945	I.W.A.
	%	%	%	%
Conservatives .	63	61	58	52½
Labour .	37½	36½	32	15
All parties .	51	48½	42	42

(I.W.A. = inter-war average)

Oxford still easily maintains its traditional lead amongst the universities that have been attended by members of parliament. Here are the figures for the 1951 House :

	Cons.	Lab.	Others	Total
Oxford .	102	38	1	141
Cambridge .	69	17	3	89
London .	9	21	1	31
Other British .	25	45	3	73
Overseas .	9	8	—	17
Net Total .	202	111	6	319

The differences between the Net Totals and the sums of the figures for each party are due to the fact that some members have attended more than one university.

The contrast between the politics of the members from Oxford and Cambridge and the politics of the members from other universities remains marked : 72½ per cent. of the 1951 Oxford M.Ps. are Conservatives, and so are 77½ per cent. of those from Cambridge, whereas 60 per cent. of those from other universities belong to the Labour Party.

Trinity College, Cambridge, continues to provide a far greater number of members of parliament than any other college in the country. It claims 37 in the present House, with Christchurch as runner-up with 32. Balliol is again third with 23, while two more Oxford colleges, New and Magdalen, are fourth and fifth with 21 and 19 respectively. No other college of any university even reaches double figures.

OCCUPATION

There are many difficulties in the way of classifying members of parliament by their occupations : for example,

some members follow more than one occupation concurrently, while others have flitted from occupation to occupation with an almost butterfly-like inconstancy. Fortunately these are only a minority, and it is possible to give with reasonable accuracy the following list of the leading occupations of the members of the 1951 House. But, for the reason stated, this must not be taken as absolutely precise.

1	Barristers (practising)	84
2	Regular Officers	48
3	Journalists and Authors	47
4	Teachers and Lecturers	43
5	Miners	36
6	Clerks and Secretaries	35
7	Farmers	33
8	Manufacturers	23
9	Solicitors	22
10	Civil Servants	20
11	Insurance and Underwriters	14
12	Merchants	13
13	Metal Workers	12
14-15	{ Physicians and Surgeons	10
	{ Political Organisers, etc.	10
16-17	{ Land etc. Agents and Surveyors	9
	{ Professional Engineers	9
18-19	{ Publishers	8
	{ Stockbrokers	8
20-21	{ Railwaymen	7
	{ Accountants	7

Between them these twenty-one occupations, or groups of occupations, cover just on 80 per cent. of the members of the House. It should perhaps be explained that 'Regular Officers' includes Navy, Army, and Air Force, but does not include those who have served only with temporary or territorial commissions; also that 'Civil Servants' includes diplomats, but neither clerks nor manual workers.

The changes shown by this list, in comparison with that for the 1950 House, are not in general very remarkable, but we may note that the Farmers have increased in number from 25 to 33, while the Metal Workers have dropped from 16 to 12. How far these figures for Farmers represent a real increase is difficult to say, since a fair number of

members appear to combine farming with other occupations, and a change of stress might therefore provide an explanation. But as the number recorded for 1945 was only 16, and the inter-war average was as low as 10, it does seem that there is some real and considerable increase in the number of farmers entering the House. Publishers, too, seem to have an increasing interest in parliament.

Now let us turn from the House of Commons as a whole to its Conservative members. We find that their leading occupations come out as follows :

1	Barristers (practising)	54
2	Regular Officers	46
3	Farmers	30
4	Journalists and Authors	21
5	Manufacturers	17
6	Civil Servants	15
7	Solicitors	11
8	Clerks and Secretaries	10
9-10	{ Merchants	9
	{ Insurance and Underwriters	9
11-12	{ Publishers	8
	{ Stockbrokers	8
	{ Political Organisers, etc.	7
13-15	{ Land etc. Agents and Surveyors	7
	{ Professional Engineers	7

These fifteen occupations, or groups of occupations, cover between them just over 80 per cent. of the Conservative members. The changes in the list since 1950 are not very notable, apart from the increase in the number of Farmers: this has gone up from 23 to 30. Perhaps there is some tendency for the number of Regular Officers to diminish; but this may well be merely a temporary fluctuation.

For the Parliamentary Labour Party the list of leading occupations comes out as follows :

1	Teachers and Lecturers	39
2	Miners	36
3-4	{ Barristers (practising)	26
	{ Journalists and Authors	26
5	Clerks and Secretaries	25
6	Metal Workers	12
7	Solicitors	10

8	Railwaymen	7
9	Physicians and Surgeons	6
10-12	Manufacturers	5
	Civil Servants	5
	Engine Drivers	5
13-17	Merchants	4
	Insurance and Underwriters	4
	Wood Workers	4
	Dock Workers	4
	Building etc. Operatives	4
18-21	Political Organisers, etc.	3
	Ministers of Religion	3
	Hairdressers	3
	Services Other Ranks	3

It will be seen that it has taken twenty-one occupations or groups of occupations to cover just under 80 per cent. of the Labour Party membership, against fifteen for the Conservatives. There seems to be a somewhat greater variety of occupations amongst the Labour members than there is amongst the Conservatives, but too much should not be made of this, since it may be largely a matter of description. None of the changes in this table calls for special comment, unless it is the drop in the number of Metal Workers; and that may be just due to chance.

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Analysing the new House of Commons by the occupational status of its members, and comparing the results with those for earlier Houses, we get these figures:

	1951	1950	1945	I.W.A.
	%	%	%	%
Employers and Managers	21½	20	17½	25
Rank-and-file Workers	23	23	27	21
Professional Workers	52	54	53½	45
Unpaid Domestic Workers	½	½	1	—
Unoccupied	3	2½	1	9
Total	100	100	100	100

It will be realised that the make-up of the House in this respect depends very much on its party make-up.

Employers and Managers form 32½ per cent. of the Conservative Parliamentary Party, but only 9 per cent. of that of Labour. On the other hand, 45 per cent. of the Labour membership consists of Rank-and-file Workers, against a tenth of that figure in the Conservative ranks. There seems to be, for once, a slight drop in the proportion of Professional Workers in each of the big parties and in the House as a whole, but this has probably little significance. For fairly obvious reasons, neither the figures for Unpaid Domestic Workers nor those for the Unoccupied can be considered very reliable.

LAWYERS AND OTHERS

It may be as well to take a special look at the large numbers of members of parliament who may be designated as lawyers, company directors, or trade-union officials. In the preceding occupation lists only those lawyers were included who were known to be practising, or to have been practising, their profession, thus excluding the considerable number who have been called to the bar but do not practise, and perhaps never had any intention of so doing. With the other categories the difficulty is that to be a company director or a trade-union official may be to have a full-time occupation in that capacity, but may alternatively be to enjoy a description that carries with it a minimum of active employment and is purely incidental to some other, much more significant, occupation. It is seldom possible to find out how, in this respect, a member should be graded; and in any event there are probably large numbers of border-line cases. Hence it is impracticable to include either company directors or trade-union officials, as such, in the lists of occupations given above. In compensation, however, here is a table showing all the members who are known to bear any of these descriptions, irrespective of whether they are practising or non-practising, or whether they are full-time or part-time:

	Cons.	Lab.	Others	Total
Lawyers	78	40	5	123
Company Directors	142	25	3	170
Trade-Union Officials	—	98	—	98
Net Total	198	153	7	358

Since quite a number of members of parliament combine legal qualifications with trade-union or limited-company activities, the Net Totals given are less than the sums of the items above them. (There is one instance of a member who is, or has been, a lawyer, a company director, and a trade-union official.)

Taking all parties together, the percentage distribution of members to these categories for the present and preceding Houses comes out as follows :

	1951	1950	1945	I.W.A.
	%	%	%	%
Lawyers	19½	20	16½	23
Company Directors	27	23	20	23
Trade-Union Officials	15½	16	20½	13
Net Total	<u>57½</u>	<u>54½</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>54½</u>

From these figures it would seem as though the number of Company Directors in the House of Commons is on the up grade. Further investigation would be necessary, however, before this could be regarded as proved.

HEREDITARY TITLES

The number of members of parliament who are connected with families of hereditary title gives us a useful measure, though admittedly a very rough one, of the extent to which the aristocratic element in the national life is represented in the House of Commons. It is significant that 95 per cent. of the members with such connections are to be found on the Conservatives benches ; and it is there that we must look for the appropriate figures. Here they are : (a) denotes Conservative members who are descendants of persons holding hereditary titles, and (b) denotes those who have themselves been granted such titles, or who have married persons holding such titles or descendants thereof.

	1951	1950	1945	I.W.A.
	%	%	%	%
(a) and (b) together	28	27	30	42
(a) alone	17	17	21	22

Having regard to all the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the position in 1951 shows little change from that in 1950.

SERVICE ON LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Service on local government bodies provides a useful form of apprenticeship prior to service in parliament, and it is probably a very good thing that so many M.Ps. have served such an apprenticeship. Here, anyway, are the figures showing how many members of the present House of Commons can claim such experience :

	Cons.	Lab.	Others	Total
County Councils . . .	41	55	2	98
Town and City Councils .	40	100	—	140
District Councils . . .	14	45	1	60
Other Local Authorities .	7	25	—	32
Net Total . . .	79	161	2	242

The ' Other Local Authorities ' include parish councils, boards of guardians, education committees (co-opted members only), and so on. The ' Net Total ' of each column is less than the sum of the items above it, because so many members have served on more than one type of local authority.

The figures show that roughly two out of every five members of the present House of Commons have had experience of service on local government bodies. As usual, the Labour members have a marked advantage in this respect ; though perhaps the much greater experience of the Conservative members in the fighting services and elsewhere provides a compensating factor. Here, anyway, are the party figures :

	1951	1950	1945
	%	%	%
Conservatives . . .	24½	25½	25
Labour . . .	54½	56	56
All parties . . .	38½	40½	44

Many of the members concerned, moreover, have attained distinction in local affairs by becoming aldermen, mayors, and so on. Here are the figures :

	1951	1950	1945
Aldermen . . .	53	55	64
Mayors . . .	28	29	44
Council Chairmen . . .	26	23	?
Net Total . . .	78	78	?

' Mayors,' of course, includes also lord mayors, provosts, and lord provosts.

CANDIDATES

After the record number of candidates (1,868) at the 1950 election, the number nominated in 1951, which was 1,376, may seem comparatively small, though even that represents an average of 2.20 candidates for each seat. The drop was, of course, chiefly due to the greatly reduced numbers of candidates put forward by the Liberal and Communist parties. The former fell by 366 and the latter by 90. There were also far fewer independent and minor-party candidates. Here are the figures :

Conservatives (plain and fancy)	618
Labour (incl. Co-op., I.L.P., etc.)	622
Liberals	109
Communists	10
Nationalists (Scots, Welsh, Irish)	10
Independents	7
Total	1,376

The fall in numbers may be regarded as due very largely to the heavy cost of contesting elections—a burden that is still far too high—and to the limited resources of the smaller parties. This gives an unfair advantage to the two big and wealthy parties,* who are also unduly favoured by our out-of-date voting methods.

VOTES AND SEATS

Had the seats obtained by each party been in proportion to the votes received by it (with due allowance for the few unopposed returns), the results would have been as follows :

Conservatives	302
Labour	304
Liberals	16
Others	3
Total	625

* See my article on ' The Incidence of Election Expenses ' in the ' Political Quarterly ' for April-June 1952.

The actual results were very different :

Conservatives	.	.	.	321
Labour	.	.	.	296
Liberals	.	.	.	6
Others	.	.	.	2
Total				625

So the Conservatives won nineteen more seats than the votes they received would warrant, gaining them at the expense of the Liberals (ten seats), Labour (eight seats), and Others (one seat). Even this, however, does not represent the full distortion produced by our inefficient way of voting, for in 516 out of 625 divisions there was no Liberal candidate, so that probably some two to three million Liberal votes could not be recorded at all ; and of course the same thing goes, though to a very much smaller extent, for the minor parties and the independents.

The number of votes per seat gained was as follows :

Conservatives	.	.	43,200
Labour	.	.	47,300
Miscellaneous	.	.	77,700
Liberals	.	.	121,800

Finally, here is the crowning absurdity of the election. In 1945 the Socialists received only 49.1 per cent. of the total poll, yet won a huge majority of seats and made haste to transform our social and economic system. In 1950 their share of the total vote dropped by only one-fortieth, to 46.4 per cent. of the total, yet their majority came tumbling down, almost to vanishing point. In 1951 they did *better* than in 1950 so far as votes went, gaining 48.7 per cent. of the total—only 0.4 per cent. less than in 1945—yet they lost the election and were turned out of office. What is the use of talking about ‘ mandates ’ or ‘ the will of the people ’ in the face of such crazily inconsistent results ?

J. F. S. Ross.

Art. 3.—THE FESTIVAL OF BRITAIN AND THE
'MESS OF CENTURIES.'

THE objective study of a typical piece of practical Socialism is often made difficult by actions and reactions from other quarters, which can be cited as reasons for the failure of plans and estimates to conform to original hope or promise. The Festival of Britain can fall back on no such type of defence. It stands out as one of the many original and curious happenings in the six years of Socialist rule, with, however, the peculiar merit that, apart from financial loss, it has left no aftermath, nothing to repair or replace and indeed little or nothing worth remembering. The story is complete and can be told without the risk that future development may require revision or throw new light upon it. It is in fact the story of a perfect piece of Socialism.

Public money in plenty ; planning for pure pleasure ; unrestrained irresponsibility ; total absence of competition ; supply without demand : indeed, everything needed to make Utopia. Conceived, planned, and carried through to a finish by typical specimens of the new governing class, the story of the Festival should help the public to understand the better what is in fact happening day by day in many national and local government offices.

A general and very generous restraint, so long as the South Bank Exhibition was open, was observed by Press and public in the expression of candid opinion on that unhappy part of the Festival. A good deal was said about the loss, estimated by the 'Daily Telegraph' to amount to 17,000,000*l.*, but hardly a word was printed which might have the effect of discouraging the participation of our own public or the attendance of such foreign visitors as were inveigled into coming here to enjoy the mysteries of the Dome of Discovery. If the critics had employed the freedom which they use with such good effect on books and plays, the South Bank Exhibition would have closed within a fortnight of the opening ceremony.

Now, as there is no more gate money to collect, it is an obvious duty to discuss, both in general and in detail, this most extraordinary episode by means of which Mr Herbert Morrison did not scruple to claim a place in history equal to that of the late Prince Consort.

THE POWER OF PROPAGANDA

The whole enterprise was indeed a disconcerting triumph for the powers of official propaganda, but has left so little behind it that it becomes the more important, while some recollections remain, to put the story on record and point the moral.

It was remarkable that during the actual run of the Exhibition, so aptly described in the 'Daily Telegraph' as the South Mountebankruptcy adventure, that it failed to serve, as should surely have been expected of an official national enterprise, as a subject of general conversation. Now nobody mentions it and it will not be long before it is entirely forgotten. People made the journey, spent their money, perhaps had a meal, and came away with a vague impression of the original, the wonderful, the stupid, or merely something out of the ordinary, which they did not pretend to understand. Very few went home to dilate upon the beauty or interest of this or that section or item. In obedience to the powers of Public Relations boosters, the Festival was a thing to be 'done' and they had 'done' it. Some came away with grumbles, and others with praise, for the food and its prices; others talked of the litter of ice-cream cartons, sandwich paper, and cigarette ends; some mentioned the London Transport bus, as being one of the few exhibits which they could understand, adding that they need hardly have paid 5s. to look at it. Millions of visitors are still at a loss to describe or explain what was to be seen behind the turnstiles.

From the gloom of the Dome of Discovery most of them emerged with the very proper feeling that its purpose and meaning were outside their personal scope or range. From Aristotle all the way to Newton, the Solar System has been a source of awe and wonder to old and young of all nations, but it had to wait for Mr Morrison to include the stars in his catalogue of Socialist triumphs.

Six months' work of the political propaganda machine and 17 millions of money lost must be added to the list of groundnuts and other futilities and follies whose name is 'planning.' No claim has been, or can be, advanced, of any help in our economic difficulties, or of any improvement in our meagre standard of living. That part of Mr Morrison's purpose which was to misrepresent the old was

certainly achieved to the full, but his hope of demonstrating our supposed 'national recovery' was of necessity wholly unfulfilled. Yet the whole effort can, however, be said to have satisfied a deep political purpose expressed years ago by the late Sir Stafford Cripps, who blushed with shame to think of the British Empire, and again, at the end of the Festival, by Mr Attlee himself, who put the spotlight on the Socialist mind with a sneer at our glorious past as 'the mess of centuries.' Stafford Cripps was always something of a person apart, and his views on our national work for the world have not until now been recognised as an expression of the true Socialist faith. Until the 1951 Election Mr Attlee had managed to avoid obvious extremes and acquired a reputation for balance and moderation. But in the heat of the hustings he finally threw off the mask and by talking of 'the mess of centuries' gave quite incidentally the answer to the riddle of the Festival.

When they came to power in 1945 on the strength of promises that everything would be planned to perfection, it may be regarded as evidence of good faith to arrange a great national celebration for six years later to mark the triumph of it all.

With a subservient House of Commons prepared to hand over dictatorial powers as and when requested, no government was ever less handicapped, and there was in theory the prospect, six years later, of comfort in plenty from ample supplies of all our needs from coal at home, to the full fruits of well planned plantation development in the Colonies. The overall picture was of a new world and the Festival was to celebrate its arrival.

Sir Gerald Barry, the Director General, with a small army of modernists and bureaucrats to help him, was wiser than his masters and laid in large reserves from geology and astronomy to be ready to fill the bill in the event of any possible failure of Utopian hopes. His instructions took no account of the practical, his task was to broaden the public mind and the tightening of belts was outside his terms of reference. With Britain, in the real meaning of the word, ruled out from the start, except as a misleading label, his task was not an easy one. This is clear from a study of the official catalogue, a collection of elementary essays or sketches which, to take the most charitable view, may be regarded as introductions to subjects and matters

having a minimum of bearing upon our present situation and serving at best to distract attention from more practical problems. From glaciers in Scotland and jungle and swamp in Birmingham 500 million years ago, to the contemplation of 'the private lives of animals and plants,' a single hour's reading created the comforting impression that in the omniscient hands of the intelligentsia, the common people could feel that all would be well.

Everything about the Exhibition was the subject of conferences and approval by a galaxy of curious councils, most of them subsidised and all immune from the contamination of personal responsibility. Scores of these bodies included the Central Council of Physical Recreation, Scientific Liaison Officers of the British Commonwealth, National Institute of Oceanography, Central Office of Information, and, of course, Town Planning and Building Research, the Council for Science and Technology, the Forestry Commission and the Council of Industrial Design.

All this organised wisdom did produce one distinct bureaucratic novelty. The various sections were each provided with an impressive list of directors, architects, engineers, display designers and commentators, but above them all appeared a new type of commissar styled 'Theme Convener.' What these people did, or how to convene a theme, is not at once apparent; the idea may perchance have derived from Milton's 'Tractate of Education' where he writes of: 'Forcing the empty wits of children to compose *themes*, verses, and orations.'

In the official guide, half-a-crown's worth of quite good, if rather expensive, reading, a few paragraphs gave full credit to the work of a few selected individual Britons in pure and applied science and ten lines were spared for Christianity. The word Empire is taboo; but from the stone, bronze and iron ages, the reader is whisked along to the contemplation of the Outerspace and the Ionosphere, and presumably to relieve his own mental strain, is reminded of the 'brain and nervous mechanisms of octopuses and squids.'

Those acquainted with the philosophic delights of theoretical work in a typical government department will be able to appreciate the joy with which Sir Gerald Barry and his Theme Conveners entered upon this veritable orgy of intellectual frivolity.

THE SOUTH BANK

Had this Festival been in every other respect all that it might have been, it was robbed of the chance of real success by the unhappy choice of a piece of waste land for the main display. In this respect the project suffered the fate of so many political schemes and a side issue served to thwart the main purpose.

The south bank of the Thames has for generations presented a problem to Londoners and other lovers of beauty, and the plans and schemes for making it a worthy part of the finest city in the world are as numerous as they have all proved to be impractical.

The first really ambitious suggestion was to put the railways under the river and thus clear all the ground lying in the south bend, now a dismal maze of embankments and arches, serving to bring the railways from the South and West to the termini in the central part of the City. Canada House and later South Africa House were redesigned and placed in Trafalgar Square in such a way as to fit into the fine central traffic road which was to replace the hideous Charing Cross Railway Bridge.

When Mr Herbert Morrison became the Leader of the London County Council he inherited the urge to do something worth while with the problem of the South Bank and was quick to grasp the opportunity presented by Waterloo Bridge, by far the most beautiful of all the structures that spanned the Thames. Rennie's masterpiece began to show signs of weakness and this gave Morrison his chance to destroy the old, which after all is the first necessity of Socialism. Muirhead's Guide to London referring to John Rennie's architectural achievement mentions 'this graceful structure described by Canova as "worth a journey from Rome to see".' There was a battle with the artists led by Arthur Keen, then Honorary Secretary of the Royal Institute of British Architects, but Morrison won and replaced a craftsman's work of beauty by a triumph of steel and concrete which might well have been imported from Stalingrad.

Waterloo Bridge was never a main traffic artery and the new structure, like the old, although having four times the capacity, is still one of the least used of the bridges across the Thames.

The unfortunate selection of the South Bank site for the purposes of the Festival can only be explained by the Morrison determination to do something with this plot of problem land. He secured an early decision, on Cabinet level, and ruled out from the very start a score of more convenient schemes and places. There ensued a grandiose replanning of roads and roundabouts, the clearing and equipping of spacious car parks, most of which were closed soon after the show began, and the throwing of an open temporary Bailey bridge across the Thames, to emphasise the old horrors of Charing Cross and Hungerford.

The Festival being over, all these unwanted and largely unused facilities will no doubt serve as reasons for finding other uses for an awkward bit of London which, from its very nature, must always enjoy the minimum of accessibility.

1851 - 1951

The whole apparatus of modern mass-propaganda was employed to persuade the public to think of the Morrison Festival as the twentieth-century counterpart of the Great Exhibition of 1851. But the closest examination of the whole, or the detail, of the two undertakings fails to discover any similarity in conception, method or purpose. The Festival endeavoured, and with some success, to rope in every town and village in the country, whereas nothing of the kind was done a century ago. A distinct fillip was given to our regular sporting and social activities. The usual village cricket week brought out a few more flags and acquired an extra glamour; dramatic, musical, literary and such societies all enjoyed a little of the general determination to be cheerful. All this was good, and, had it not been marred by deceptive official advertising in the United States, did certainly help us to put some of our troubles aside for a few brief months.

But comparing only the Crystal Palace in Hyde Park with the buildings on the South Bank and the purposes to which they were both put, reveals a wide division of aim and idea, with a minimum of thought in common. The initial triumph of 1851 was the use of glass and steel on a larger scale than had ever been attempted and the provision of accommodation under one roof for all-comers. The contrast with the conglomeration of odd-shaped

buildings, for which no claims of beauty have been advanced, speaks for itself; from the main entrance in Waterloo Road or from the other side of the river there was nothing in outward appearance to suggest that beauty, taste, culture, sense of proportion, or any of the finer feelings had been allowed to enter into the scheme of things.

An even wider difference between the two '51's is apparent from a comparison of the exhibits themselves. In Hyde Park the individual manufacturers bought space in which to display their new patterns, designs and inventions. From a thousand different sources of inspiration and initiative there was collected, as in any market-place, a wide variety of old and new ideas submitted to the unerring judgment of a free public for acceptance, rejection, approval or disdain. There was in fact that Freedom of Choice without which Professor Hayek has shown life is mere serfdom.

At the South Bank instead of anxious producers seeking to win the favour of an intelligent and discriminating public, the visitor was confronted with chosen samples, selected and arranged by hole-and-corner Councils, who together constitute a sort of T.U.C. of thought, art, and endeavour. The general attitude towards a submissive and well-planned public was—not 'How do you like this?' 'What is your opinion?' 'Is it worth while from your point of view?'—but 'This is good for you,' 'This is what you ought to see,' 'The experts know what you should think!'

The two '51's were not only in different centuries but in different worlds, the first designed to encourage and inspire, the second to plan, dragoon, and inculcate the idle comfort of the theory that our intellectual betters will provide for us.

In 1851 the foreign buyer was received at each individual exhibit by a representative of the exhibitor, ready, perhaps over-anxious, to answer every question and explain every detail. Above all he was impressed by the names which put themselves forward as the guarantors of service and quality. In 1951 the foreign buyer whose attention was attracted by a particular exhibit was not worried with solicitations which may or may not have been welcome; on the contrary, he was required to work his way through a ten-shilling catalogue and by following the cross references find out for himself the name and address of the firm or

person to whom he could apply for any information he desired. The stigma of the commercial, the impiety of profit and all the supposed horrors of a period of progress were deliberately rooted out of this Festival of co-ordinated 'Culture' by our Brains' Trust Bosses.

Mr Morrison's impertinence in comparing himself with the Prince Consort is emphasised by the attendance figures of the two Exhibitions. The South Bank succeeded in improving to some slight extent on the figures of Hyde Park; but in 1851 there was not so much as a bicycle to compete with all the modern facilities for travel and transport of which Mr Morrison had the full advantage.

TRADE TABOO

A Festival of Britain which for all practical purposes ignored the world of Commerce and Finance was perhaps not quite, but nearly, as deficient as a 'Hamlet' without the Prince.

There was a mention of our over-population, but the school-child, or the foreigner, would not have been able to gather from this display that half our food was earned by our Commerce. The coffee, which we went to the continent to enjoy because we ourselves did not know how to make it, was bought and sold, as to nine-tenths of the whole of it, in Mincing Lane, London. A cargo of timber from Canada to Cape Town moved by virtue of documents arranged in London, the risks insured by London, the cash made available in Canada and collected from Cape Town by London, where alone all the facilities essential to such business were instantly available in their most economical form. The Italian who had a few thousand pounds to collect in Bolivia, to settle a claim in Singapore, could if need be arrange the whole business on the telephone with London. A merchant in Montevideo who required ship space for a consignment to Greece, could discover from the Baltic Exchange that on the following Tuesday-week S.S. Soandso would be at his disposal. It is in thousands of such ways that we earn a goodly portion of our food and render singular service to the whole of mankind. The very scant attention given to this very British part of our national work justifies the suggestion of fraudulent misrepresentation.

THE FESTIVAL AND THE CHILDREN

School-children by the hundred thousand were marched into the South Bank with the supposition that they would learn something about Britain. Almost any morning during the run of the Festival, a half-mile queue of happy little faces, starting at Charing Cross, reaching Scotland Yard, and back again to Charing Cross to make the trek across the Bailey bridge, recalled to the mind

A dream that the voices
Of England have sung,
That is born in the blood
And the eyes of the young.

Only the ultra-churlish will quarrel with a scheme, however expensive, which was designed to give so much pleasure to so many young citizens, and all will agree that to teach our children about Britain must be to the good. But while the Festival could claim some vague relationship with the Utopian Britain of the planned future, there was little to learn of the achievements of the past. A great heritage is of small value to those who know nothing of its origins and history.

To some of us, surely most of us, the word 'Britain' denotes a certain quality or character which has put our little island on the very top of the world and served mankind in general as a beacon, pattern or model for every advance everywhere towards a more civilised way of life. Our American cousins who have now taken the lead from our enfeebled hands are always eager to trace their personalities and their triumphs back to Britain and thus establish their right to regard Chaucer, Shakespeare, Newton, and a host of others as part of their own English-speaking heritage.

Peoples of all races and colours have thanked their gods for Britain, the symbol of freedom, the fountain of justice, the basis of credit and confidence. Spanish-speaking South and Central Americans are typical of other peoples and places in their use of Britain as the hall-mark of honour and truth. *Palabra de inglés*, 'the word of an Englishman,' is still to be heard wherever Spanish is spoken as meaning 'honour bright.' When, therefore, our children were asked to join in a Festival of Britain they were entitled to expect

to hear and see something of a glorious story which has made the name worth having.

St George and the Dragon, Gog and Magog, King Alfred and the Cakes, Drake, Raleigh, Dick Whittington, are known to the whole of mankind as symbols of the birth and growth of a civilisation, 'When Britain first, at heaven's command, Arose from out the azure main.' But the admitted purpose of the promoters of this ill-fated festival was to lead us to some, still to be discovered, new way to the millennium, and all such homely, simple human memories were ruled out at the very start. There was, it would seem, a fixed determination that the rising generation should know nothing of the patriotism of the past. For example, the failure to employ all the riches and beauty of heraldry, to remind us of our breed and breeding, was conscious and deliberate. There was a positive surfeit of what purported to be bunting but turned out upon examination to be mere gaudiness without a thought behind it.

The Union Jack was there if one looked for it, but seeing that every county, city and regiment, and hundreds of schools, societies, guilds, and established institutions would have delighted to contribute their standards, arms and historical insignia, it was a pity that the heavily subsidised arts and cultural councils should have sought their inspiration in the egos of daubers who only demonstrated the urgent need for another Renaissance.

A circular from Sir Gerald Barry to the brewers of the country would have produced without expense a thousand historical inn signs, each having in every line some link with the real Britain. That, however, might have led the foreign visitor to ask awkward questions about the roast beef of Old England.

Had our children been invited to come to a show, a scientific display, or an exhibition of novelty, there would have been no grounds for complaint, but to label as British an enterprise with so little national quality about it, must be regarded, to put it mildly, as a cruel deception.

THE EXHIBITS

Of the exhibits themselves one general observation may serve to explain the absence of interest and enthusiasm on the part of the public. Every object put on view was

there by virtue of an invitation from one or other of the cultural councils, which from their natures were simply concerned with their own opinions of what the public ought to be allowed to see. There was on all hands a curious sense of straining away from accepted ideas, which however commendable in individuals in competition, was elevated to a ruling official policy. The general impression may be compared to a plate of condiments and sauce without any meat.

Just inside the main entrance was a bookstall which by common practice and for general convenience should have been on the ground level to give the maximum opportunity for visitors to pause and browse. But the new genius, which can 'convene a theme,' is not satisfied by anything conventional and so an artificial pond was designed over the centre of which a smaller platform was erected with the bookstall in the air. The loss of opportunity to examine books was balanced by the thrill of mounting one staircase and descending another with the possibility of a slip and a ducking in the process. An official guide pointing to this curiosity remarked, 'Rather jolly, don't you think?' and then turning to a piece of twisted bronze which might have been a weather vane after an air raid but was labelled 'female figure in repose' added with a smile, 'Some people fail to see its beauty, but they'll learn in time.'

No mention was made in the catalogue of the control of traffic, but those who were responsible for receiving, arranging, and passing out hundreds of thousands of persons at a time, exercised an overall influence on the whole enterprise for which full credit must be awarded. The bookstall served as a first introduction to a plan or method governing almost every movement behind the turnstiles. If at any moment there was too much interest in books and any inclination to linger, the pressure from behind would impel progress round the elevated platform and down the steps on the exit side. This very practical system, much elaborated, enabled thousands at a time to grope their way into, and eventually out of, the gloom of the Dome of Discovery, upstairs, along a railed gallery, downstairs and by the aid of illuminated arrows, round the corner to carry on with the crowd. On a ten-shilling day it was generally possible to make a careful study of one or more of the wonderful peep-shows crowded into this

ambitious attempt to explain the earth and the seas and the stars, relieved here and there with an item connected with the story of Britain. Queueing and pressing were the inescapable consequences of the inadequacy of the South Bank site and perhaps here is the real explanation of the distressing fact that only a minority of those who gave a day to this wonderful panorama went home with any clear-cut conception of what they had seen.

The Crystal Palace of 1851 was a triumph for the makers of glass and the South Bank should be known as the Gala of the Gas Pipe. Some scores of miles of steel tubing were made to serve every purpose from the support of the Dome of Discovery to the simple garden chairs of which there was an ample supply. The theme behind some of these piping originalities remains to be explained ; large irregular triangles each stuck upon a couple of tripods, decorated with vari-coloured Belisha beacons, diminutive bits of gaudy bunting and a few fairy-lights simply served to show that planning need not have a serious purpose.

By contrast the Skylon hanging in mid-air, with no visible means of support, was a commendably serious effort to make plain the economic position of the Socialist Britain to which the whole Festival was dedicated.

The less said the better about the enormous murals which purported to decorate a number of the bigger wall spaces. To call some of them caricatures or lampoons is to be over polite, nor is it pleasant to notice that in the judgment of the pundits of the Comintern of the Arts, to be an Englishman was no disqualification for a place in this repulsive section of the show. One of these great canvasses purports to impress the mind of the young with the wonders of our herring-fishing industry, but in fact displayed, on the bottom of the ocean, a very badly over-sexed half-fish half-female, well calculated to rob the youthful imagination of the charm and romance which the mythical mermaid has hitherto provided for our delight.

Another more amusing exhibit with the same cynical background took the form of a mechanical fountain. Based upon a determination to have nothing whatever to do with the upward urge, the source of hope and inspiration, sensed by the normal soul in the natural striving of a jet of water to reach the highest level, the theme seems to have had its origin in a coal-conveyor or perhaps a river dredger. A

number of big scoops and pans of irregular form and shape were put, one above the other, into a perpendicular whole, suggesting nothing that can be related to everyday experience. Water was pumped to the top of this Heath Robinson contraption, and as each bucket was filled it lost its balance and splashed its contents to the one below. Manufacturers of those irritating uncertainties the common flushing cistern may perchance find, in this affair, helpful suggestions for improvement in design, or school-boys with Meccano sets be fired with new ideas for making messes at home. For the rest of us we could only pay our admission money and be thankful that we required no licence or even identity card to look and weep.

The pavilion labelled The Lion and The Unicorn held out the prospect that the visitor might perchance find something going back before the day when Arts and other Councils saved us all the trouble of having tastes and ideas of our own. Approaching the entrance one hoped to find, perhaps, the pillars of Hampton Court with these familiar beasts in their original, dignified and authentic forms. Instead some artistic wag had contrived to twist a mass of gilded straw to look rather more like a lion than a golliwog, holding a stick or baton with which he was belabouring a companion effigy of the Unicorn. All sense of majesty or dignity was successfully suppressed. Suspended above the entrance was an immense wicker-work bird-cage from which a clay dove of peace reminded the visitor that 'fighting for the crown' is a thing of the past. The matter was apparently submitted to a 'theme' convention, when somebody pointed out the incongruity of any idea of the Ark in this riot of modernism, and so there were a hundred or more white clay pigeons, suspended from the roof by wires, and presumably mobilising for a flight to Lake Success. This if you please in the one and only pavilion which proclaimed itself to be devoted to our 'native genius,' but which Mr Laurie Lee, the official commentator, speaking for all his colleagues at the South Bank, finds 'as difficult to define as a British nonsense rhyme.'

To link up the Lion and Unicorn with our love of sport, there was a long glass bench on which was a curious collection of sporting oddments. A couple of cricket balls, an unstrung bow and a bunch of attenuated arrows, a pair of riding boots on lasts, a putter and two curling irons,

into which were introduced an earthenware pitcher, a typewriting machine and a military drum. The visitor was puzzled to know what this waste of time was intended to suggest ; should he desire to buy the putter or anything else he must first purchase a ten-shilling catalogue, search out the name of the manufacturer and then go home and make his own inquiries. But on reflection he concluded that this particular exhibit was the work of a psychiatrist and merely a glorified intelligence test. The Majesty of the Law was represented by the robes of the Lord Chancellor enlarged and stretched to fit a figure four times the normal height and girth.

Six years of Socialism having produced nothing about which to festivate, a new type of being was created and called a Theme Convener and instructed that:

Whatever was, must be lampooned ;
whatever is, must be forgotten, and
whatever may be, left to the intelligentsia.

Unrest must be encouraged, harmony forbidden ; symmetry, repose, comfort, satisfaction, stability, solidity, and other such Victorian conceptions must be expunged from the memory.

Sunlight, even daylight, were too bourgeois for admission to the Dome of Discovery and other buildings, the hypnotic basis of the new life requiring that the natural faculties should be dimmed. Above all there was the implied determination that nothing about the Festival should conflict in any way with Mr Attlee's conception of the glorious history of our dear country as 'the mess of centuries.' And the triumph of it all was to produce the impression of a jolly good show ; an impression which rapidly faded as all this was recognised as just a typical sample of the work of the sort of people who are now in control of so much of the life of the nation and indeed of the world.

ERNEST BENN.

Art. 4.—THE CASE AGAINST ALCOHOL-DRINKING.

IN an article in the 'Quarterly Review' for January 1949, on 'The Missing of Truth,' the present writer drew attention to the overwhelming power of the herd instinct beneath the veneer in life, creating 'climates of opinion' which even the ablest men are unable to overcome. That the facts are against something that is popular, that it is lethal, that it lowers life—all this does not matter: popular opinion ignores the case against the pet indulgence.

Life is a struggle. Even to maintain life requires effort: hence the need for rest, recuperation, sleep. Biological progress has consisted in the building up of controls in the most complicated patterns. The test of achievement is integration in the right scale of values: integration achieves integrity. It is in the *struggle* that the real solution of the mystery of life is to be found: thereby is developed character; it is the development of this inner strength and wisdom that is the clue. It is easier to relax and relapse on the lower instincts.

Perhaps the best test of intellectual integrity to-day is a person's attitude to alcohol-drinking. Nearly everybody claims to be willing to face facts and draw the necessary inferences. Let us bring this to the test. The popular attitude takes the view that only excessive drinking is harmful and that drunkenness is not a serious problem. Even the latter point is not correct. The facts are that in 1950 (the latest year for which figures are available), although the consumption of beer was 4 per cent. lower than in 1949, the consumption of spirits was 10 per cent. higher and of imported wines 7 per cent. higher and offences of drunkenness were the highest since 1939. But let us turn to alcohol-drinking pure and simple.

The Ministry of Education's 'Health Education' says, 'Alcoholic drinks tend to make a person more rather than less thirsty.' Alcohol is a narcotic drug. The Liquor Traffic Control Board Advisory Committee's report entitled 'Alcohol, its Action on the Human Organism,' 1928, a classic on the subject, said, 'The direct effect of alcohol on the human body is in all stages and upon the whole system that of a narcotic drug.'

Alcohol, when drunk in spirits, wine, and beer, is not changed by the digestive processes, but rapidly passes into

the blood-stream and is thereby carried to the various parts of the body. Different people react differently to alcohol in respect of the amount they absorb into the blood. The man who is accustomed to it requires more to intoxicate him than the unseasoned drinker, although he suffers from the damage done to him through his addiction. The degree of intoxication is proportionate to the amount of alcohol a person has absorbed into his blood.

Alcohol is oxidised from the body slowly, at the rate of about 7 cubic centimetres per hour. Thus the alcohol in one pint of light ale is in definite contact for $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours after drinking; half a gill of whisky for 4 hours; half a pint of port for 8 hours.

What does alcohol in the body do? It first puts to sleep the higher centres: it diminishes self-criticism, and therefore it creates an illusory sense of self-satisfaction. This is the simple explanation of why people drink alcohol. Let it be remembered that the essence of our organisation is controls. Alcohol takes the brakes off. This explains the common misunderstanding that alcohol is a stimulant. The Medical Research Council said, 'The popular belief in the stimulating properties of alcohol as regards nervous and other functions seems to be purely of subjective origin and illusory. The apparent stimulation is the effect of the narcotic influence of the drug, which dulls the drinker's perception of the unpleasant conditions in himself and his surroundings and may make him *feel* better, more efficient, and stronger than he really is.' 'Alcohol, its Action on the Human Organism' says, 'When the individual has to meet an emergency which calls for the exercise of his highest powers of perception and judgment, alcohol is not merely useless, it is unequivocally detrimental.'

The argument that alcohol has any food value, wrote Sir Gowland Hopkins, is due to the fact that it is oxidised in the body. But, he pointed out, citric and tartaric acids are also oxidised in the body, yet nobody would suggest that they are food. The fact is, he said, that the oxidation of alcohol in the body is the result of the body's attempt to get rid of a poison.

Because beer is made of barley, sugar and yeast, wine of grapes, and so on, it is widely believed that alcoholic drinks impart nutritional values of such ingredients. But the fact is that the dietetic values of the constituents are

destroyed in the manufacture. The protein in beer is less than 1 per cent. ; in the original barley it is 13 per cent. There are only the merest traces of sugar. There is as much energising power in a few pence worth of sugar as in twenty pints of beer. On this Sir Gowland wrote :

' One often meets with the implication that our ordinary alcoholic beverages have a nutritional value apart from that supposed to belong to the alcohol they contain. Whisky and other spirits, of course, have none. The lighter wines contain some traces of sugar, together with very small amounts of gum and glycerine, of negligible nutritive value. In order to obtain, at most, half an ounce of sugar, an intoxicating amount of most wines is required. Coming now to beer, I have, to say the truth, hardly patience to deal with the often suggested and sometimes vaunted nutritional value of that beverage. The claim, when not wholly insincere, is ridiculous. A pint of beer mostly sold to-day contains some carbohydrate material, but even this material is so altered by fermentation that we do not know whether it has real value as food.'

The Royal Commission on Licensing, 1929-31, said, ' The use of alcohol as an aid to work is physiologically unsound.'

Not only is alcohol not a food, it is not a medicine. It could be of use medically, apart from merely narcotic purposes (for which better narcotics, without the bad consequences of alcohol, are available), only for the purpose of taking brakes off and allowing blood to flow more quickly to the confines of the body. The need for this arises very rarely and it is obvious that this action is attended by rapid loss of heat, which may be dangerous. Alcohol is not only not a medicine, it is deleterious to health in various ways. The Ministry of Education's ' Handbook on Health Education ' says :

' Alcohol lowers the resistance of the body to disease : that is to say, a person who habitually drinks alcoholic beverages is more likely to contract illness than one who does not. Wounds, sores, and cuts heal less rapidly in a person who takes beer and spirits than in one who does not, and such a person is more liable to suffer from blood poisoning. . . . The habitual drinking of beer, wine, and spirits may tend to weaken the muscles of the heart and of the body generally and so diminish the power and capacity to work.'

Gastric cells secrete vitamin B : alcohol destroys the capacity of these cells to secrete these vitamins : people

who drink alcohol habitually become in consequence less able to assimilate food. Professor J. B. S. Haldane has written, 'A man is about five times as likely to get cancer if he drinks beer daily and no milk as if he drinks milk daily and no beer.' The alcoholic individual is three times as prone to develop pneumonia as the teetotaler and ten times less likely to recover. Most insurance companies will not insure publicans at all. Total abstainers are charged smaller premiums than people who take alcohol, because they have a higher expectation of life. Under the National Health Service doctors are not allowed to prescribe alcohol, and the use of alcohol in medicine has declined to vanishing point. It has been established in America that 6 per cent. of all moderate drinkers turn into compulsive alcoholics and the authorities are not aware of any means for predicting whether an individual will become an alcoholic.

Alcohol has of course an important influence on sex. As by the taking of alcohol the controls are taken off progressively, if a man wants to get a woman to yield to him sexually, he gives her alcohol; if a woman wants to make it easy for herself to yield to a man, she takes it. Kipling tells how he was converted to prohibition :

'The other sight of the evening was a horror. The little tragedy played itself out at a neighbouring table where two very young men and two very young women were sitting. It did not strike me till far on in the evening that the pimply young reprobates were making the girls drunk. They gave them red wine and then white, and the voices rose slightly and the maidens' cheeks flushed. It was sickening to see because I knew what was going to happen.

'They got indubitably drunk. At the close of the performance, the quieter maiden laughed vacantly and protested she couldn't keep her feet. The four linked arms and, staggering, flickered out into the street, drunk. They disappeared down a side avenue, but I could hear their laughter long after they were out of sight.

'And they were all children of 16 and 17. Then, recanting all previous opinions, I became a prohibitionist. Better it is that a man should go without his beer in public places and content himself with swearing at the narrowmindedness of the majority than to bring temptation to the lips of young fools such as the four that I had seen. I understand now why the preachers rage against drink. I have said, "There is no harm

in it, taken moderately," and yet my own demand for beer helped indirectly to send those two girls reeling down the dark street to—God alone knows what end.'*

The Deputy Medical Officer of Health for Bristol recently reported that 'promiscuity is at a high level at closing-time for public-houses.' Young women tend to take more alcohol than young men inasmuch as the latter often drink beer while the former drink gin or rum. Alcohol taken by a pregnant woman passes in the blood-stream into every part of her child: taken by a nursing mother, it passes in the milk into the child. Mr Justice Finnemore stated in 1951 that alcohol was doing more to fill the divorce and criminal courts than any other cause. At a recent Assize, twenty-one out of twenty-two cases were attributed, directly and indirectly, to alcohol-drinking. Truly there is a wide range of immoral behaviour which alcohol leads to.

Alcohol, even in small quantities, lengthens reaction-time. The late Sir William Willcox wrote:

'It has been shown that the "reaction time," or response by muscular action to a stimulus such as a flash of light, takes an appreciable time, being about one-fifth of a second in a normal person. The effect of a small quantity of alcohol, such as a glass of beer or an ordinary drink of whisky, causes an appreciable lengthening of the "reaction time," varying with the individual. Then again, moderate amounts of alcohol affect the judgment and the rapid decisions necessary in a sudden emergency. They may cause a tendency to take unjustifiable risks. The subconscious outlook is also impaired.'

It immediately leaps to the mind that this has a most important bearing on motoring. Should we license public-houses along our railway lines for the use of engine-drivers? Engine-drivers are expected to be absolutely sober while on duty. Yet the risks on the road are vastly greater than on the railway. The train is limited to rails and controlled by signals. Motorists kill more people in one year than all the railways in Britain have killed since railways began. Some years ago the Government of the time asked the British Medical Association to advise as to the effect of alcohol on road accidents. A committee of great authority returned a report so adverse to alcohol that the Government, knowing how unpopular it would be, did

* 'American Notes,' New York: Hurst, p. 118.

not publish it. In 1950 (the latest year for which statistics are available at the time of writing) 5,012 persons were killed and 196,313 injured on the roads of this country. In Sweden Dr Goldberg came to the conclusion that even a slight amount of alcohol caused a deterioration of between 25 and 30 per cent. in the driving performance of expert drivers. A normal eye can see distinctly about 30 feet ahead: the alcohol contained in one or two glasses of beer can reduce that distance by one-third. The Ministry of Transport has reported that 'more deaths and serious accidents occur upon the roads during the hour between 10 and 11 p.m. than in any other hour of the day.' Judge Scobell Armstrong said recently, 'If I go to a public dance about 8.30, the room is practically empty. At 10 there is an influx. The people can go on drinking after closing hours. One knows that the intoxicated people are going to drive themselves and their partners on motor vehicles.'

Professor Widmark, of the University of Lund, Sweden, found that the amount of alcohol in the blood that constitutes a person a danger to the public while driving a motor vehicle is 0.1 per cent. His test has been accepted in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Switzerland, the United States of America—and in London. Since the test has been adopted in Denmark the accident rate due to alcoholic drivers has dropped from 10 to 2 per cent. In Norway no one is allowed to drive a motor vehicle within eight hours of his having taken any alcohol at all, and it is illegal to sell beer to motorists. In Sweden any driver whom medical examination proves to have the slightest trace of alcohol in his blood is automatically sent to prison. In France, after the second offence of driving whilst under the influence of drink, the driver has his licence withdrawn (yet there are only 4.4 vehicles to the mile in France as against 15.3 here).

In this country Article 3 of 'The Highway Code' says:

'Alcohol, even in small amounts, lowers your alertness and sense of caution. A fraction of a second may make all the difference between safety and disaster. If you cannot give the necessary concentration, you are risking not only your own life but also the lives of others. Many drugs have the same effect and so also has fatigue.'

The number of accidents on our roads and the relation of alcohol to them became so inescapable that in 1951 the Lord Chief Justice made the following pronouncement in his court. He said that for eighteen months he had been addressing magistrates all over England, and he wished to say in court what he had said to them—namely, that driving under the influence of drink was one of the worst offences it was possible to commit. A motor-car in the hands of a man under such influence was a most dangerous instrument and the driver was placing the lives of His Majesty's subjects in peril. It must never be considered in mitigation that no one was injured. If someone was, the driver could be charged with another offence. The offence consisted of doing a dangerous and wicked thing which placed other people in danger, and the question magistrates should ask themselves was whether any reason existed why the offender should not be sent to prison. He was convinced that the terrible toll of the roads would go on until magistrates passed really severe sentences for this grave crime. Drunken drivers were as great a menace as a mad dog and ought to be dealt with severely.

A conference was held on alcohol and the road-user. Its President, Dr A. L. Goodhart, Q.C., Master of University College, Oxford, said, 'It is the man who is quarter-seas-over without his realising it that causes most of the accidents.' This was powerfully supported by the Chief Constable of Nottingham, who proved that when public-houses were closing, the street-accident rate was nearly double the rate at other times of the day. In the 'Daily Express' banner headlines dealt with the 'growing menace' and announced the appointment of official inquiries by the British Medical Association and the British Medical Council.

As to the effect of alcohol on pilots of aeroplanes—in 1949 an investigation was held and the report stated, 'The pilots who were given whisky obtained the expected low marks.' The British Overseas Airways Corporation does not allow anyone connected with the flying of an aeroplane to take alcohol for eight hours before a flight or at any time during a flight. A number of American airlines do not serve alcohol on planes, refuse transport to intoxicated persons, and do not allow flight crews to take alcohol within twenty-four hours before flying.

The anti-social effects of alcohol-drinking in Australia and New Zealand were such that the bars now close at 6 p.m. When there is a referendum, the women's votes keep closing-time at 6.

Now let us turn to the economics of alcohol-drinking. First of all, let us see that even the colossal taxation on alcohol is very far from compensating for the still more colossal losses it entails. Taxation has been imposed on alcoholic drinks in order to keep down consumption. The gross amounts spent on alcoholic drinks in this country in 1950 (the latest year for which the figures are available at the time of writing) were: beer, 488,000,000*l.*; wines, spirits, cider, 239,000,000*l.*; total 727,000,000*l.* In the case of spirits, taxation is much higher than the average. Of a bottle of whisky costing 33*s.* 4*d.* the total cost is made up as follows: duty, 24*s.* 7*d.*; wholesale and retail margins, 4*s.* 1½*d.*; profits, 3*s.* 8*d.*; barley, 8*d.*; bottle and cork, 2½*d.*; labour, 1*d.* Over the whole field of alcoholic drinks, taxation is roughly 50 per cent.—let us say 350,000,000*l.* Even taking this figure, without considering losses entailed by alcohol-drinking, it is to be compared with our total expenditure on all fuel and lighting of 376,000,000*l.* But as against the yield of 350,000,000*l.* the debit entries are as follows.

(1) With our 50,000,000 population on this small island we suffer land famine. We produce only two-fifths of the food we need. In January 1952 the President of the National Farmers' Union said that every year Britain was losing 50,000 acres of agricultural land and soon the loss would be equal to half the wheat crop or the whole of the potato crop.* Consequently, the vital need of our time is to save every bit of land we can for food production. Yet we use 2,083,000 acres for growing barley and 23,000 acres for growing hops. (800,000 tons of grain and other useful foods are wasted in brewing and 250,000 in distilling.) This land ought, of course, to be used for the best food production. Instead, we grow inferior food, barley, and turn it into a narcotic drug, and large quantities of this we export in order to import food! This may be truly described, in a phrase of Bernard Shaw's, as the economics of bedlam. Beer-making wastes enough grain to feed 7,000,000 people.

* Broadcast news, Jan. 21, and 'The Times,' Jan. 22.

(2) Every year we waste 67,000 tons of our precious sugar on alcohol, vast quantities of our precious fuel in the transport of the drink trade. There is a famine in man-power: yet 692,000 are employed in the alcohol industry; 60,000 in growing barley; and 11,000 in growing hops. The drink trade employs more man-power than the gas, water, and electrical supply undertakings together.

(3) This is not the end of the labour-shortage created by the alcohol industry. Whilst necessities are rationed, alcoholic drinks can be sold without limit, with the result that 'the trade' can give wages and conditions that attract labour from essential industries.

(4) There is a famine for capital. The vast capital sunk in the production, distribution, and sale of alcoholic drinks is worse than useless.

(5) This waste is largely aided by great expenditure on advertising (much of it making claims for alcohol contrary to proved truth), operating in direct opposition to the great sums spent by the Government in advertising saving, road safety, and production. Nearly half of our working-class families do no National Saving, yet we spend on an average 1*l.* 1*s.* a week per family of four on drink. Seven shillings are spent on alcohol for every 1*l.* spent on food. More than twenty times as much is spent on alcohol as the total net savings in the Post Office Savings Bank, trustee savings banks, and by purchase of National Savings certificates. The food subsidies, designed to reduce the cost of living, are more than swallowed up in the average family expenditure on alcoholic drinks. During the 1914-18 war Lloyd George's highly authoritative committee on the subject estimated that alcohol drinking in this country lowered national production by 15 per cent.

(6) As Bernard Shaw pointed out, the traders in alcoholic drink leave the taxpayers to pay for all the mischief the men who have drunk the alcohol may entail—the crimes, the sexual harms, the illness, the costs of prisons, mental hospitals, police, law courts, and so on that alcohol is responsible for. If the cost of such things were charged against the drink trade instead of against taxes, rates, national insurance, the nominal national profit in money from the trade would be replaced by a large deficit. Now the trader gets the profits and the public stands the losses.

(7) Because of alcohol-drinking we import large quantities of stuff that we ought not to. We import 80,000 tons of barley from Russia annually. In 1946 we imported 6,888,956 gallons of rum ; 7,783,782 gallons of wine ; and more port than any other country in the world—1,100,000 gallons. During the first half of 1947 Britain's port-wine purchases increased five-fold ; during the same period the U.S.A. reduced her imports of port wine to one-tenth of her 1946 purchases. In 1948 the Government issued licences for the importation from the West Indies of 13 million bottles of rum in bulk and 6 million bottles of rum. In 1949 Britain was France's best customer for wines, beating the United States, although having only one-third of the latter's population ; it bought half a million gallons of champagne. In 1951 Britain was importing more wine of all types than in any period since the war. In the first seven months of that year (the latest period for which statistics are available at time of writing), imports of wine were nearly double those of the corresponding part of the year before ; 6,218,236 gallons of rum and half-a-million gallons of brandy were imported in the same *seven months*. Naturally, Americans have commented on our taking their charity whilst squandering our substance in this way. Sir Montague Burton said recently, ' If Italian vermouth to the value of 240,000*l.* and port to the value of 1,600,000*l.* had not been imported, but machinery had been bought instead, the economic condition of this country would have been much better than it is.'

(8) Suppose the great quantities of money involved in the trade in alcoholic drinks had been saved. The amount spent on alcoholic drinks averages 11*s.* 6*d.* per head per week—1*l.* 5*s.* per family—65*l.* per year. If this money were saved through insurance or house-purchase, during a working life of, say, forty years, it would provide a capital sum of 4,450*l.* on retirement.

(9) Suppose the large quantities of capital, labour, plant were used to produce food, clothing, houses !

In the light of such considerations it is not surprising that at least two Chancellors of the Exchequer, Lloyd George and Snowden, testified that alcoholic drink is entirely uneconomic. The Royal Commission on Licensing said : ' It is our belief that the benefits to be derived from the diminution of the present excessive expenditure on

alcohol would progressively compensate for any loss on taxation-yield from that source.'

It is the moderate drinkers, almost entirely, who maintain the liquor industry, and therefore they, and not merely those who drink excessively, who bear the moral responsibility.

Professor Arnold Toynbee holds that the collapse of all civilisations has been due to the peoples concerned deteriorating and that alcohol is one of the chief agents.

It is sometimes said that France, although it drinks 22 litres of alcohol per head per annum, does not suffer. There is ample evidence, on the contrary, that it has suffered calamitously. The fall of France in 1940 was largely due to alcohol. In 1951, in 'The Times' for Dec. 6, appeared a column with the heading 'Alcoholism in France. Heavy Cost to the Nation.' A French Government report stated that cases of illness due to the consumption of spirits had trebled between 1945 and 1950. There were now one million people suffering from alcoholic poisoning. Referring to the 'appalling ravages of alcoholism,' the report said that in psychiatric hospitals 25 per cent. of the cases were of alcoholic origin. The problem is the slow intoxication of the organism. The German occupation, when alcohol was difficult to obtain, revealed what alcohol has cost the country before and after the war. The cost to the state in 1950 of alcoholic poisoning was estimated at over 3,000 m. francs—hospital charges, upkeep of prisoners, education of children of alcoholics. It does not include the bill for road accidents, labour in general, burials, social security, and loss of working time. Taken together, all the charges exceed the revenue which the state derives from taxes on drink.

In spite of the facts given above, by the age of 18 three-quarters of our youth are familiar with intoxicants and have come to like them. Over 80 per cent. of adults drink alcohol. Those who seek popularity play down to them. Hence the glorification of the public-houses and drinking by the B.B.C., the cinema, the press, the theatre.*

* 'The Lancet,' Dec. 8, 1951: 'Attempts at social reablement will often fail while alcoholism remains a topic for music-hall jokes—even with the B.B.C.' This article estimated that in the United Kingdom there were half-a-million habitual heavy drinkers and over one hundred thousand chronic alcoholics. For a study of alcoholics in America see 'The Manchester Guardian Weekly,' Jan. 17, 1952.

Drink providers exploit weakness in their fellow men and make money out of it. Are they denounced as capitalists and bloodsuckers? Are they held in obloquy? On the contrary, for the sake of their money they are deferred to; they have honours bestowed on them; they are given positions of influence; they are popular. In practically every large town there is a wet canteen at the police office. Lord Jowitt, when Lord Chancellor, exacted a pledge from every member of every licensing bench that he bore no prejudice against the trade.

Early in 1948 there was a strike of brewery workers in Sydney, New South Wales, which lasted two months. All the Sydney newspapers reported the favourable results on the life of the city. They testified that former beer-drinkers found their health improved. Crimes noticeably declined. Fights and street brawls almost disappeared. The police were enthusiastic about the improvement in public order. Accidents—especially in the streets—were notably reduced: one eminent doctor declared that scores of children were running about safe and sound who, but for the beer strike, would have been in hospital or mortuary. Home life showed a marked improvement, especially in the relation between husband and wife. Industrial absenteeism declined and output rose.

In this country, writing on 'Men in the Pits,' Mr F. Zweig said, 'I can testify that whenever you find a bright man who has achieved something in life either in the material or intellectual sense, or who has been able to bring up a large and educated family, he is invariably a teetotaler.'

Samuel Butler wrote:

'The Erewhonians were really a very difficult people to understand. The most glaring anomalies seemed to afford them no inconvenience; neither, provided that they did not actually see the money dropping out of their pockets nor suffer immediate physical pain, would they listen to arguments as to the waste of money and happiness which their folly cost them.'

R. F. RATTRAY.

Art. 5.—SCOTT'S KNOWLEDGE OF SHAKESPEARE.

DURING his lifetime and for many years after his death Sir Walter Scott was often called the Scottish Shakespeare, although he himself disclaimed the comparison when he wrote in his 'Journal' the oft-quoted sentence: 'The blockheads talk of my being like Shakespeare—not fit to tie his brogues.' That was written in 1826, but when Scott reviewed the First Series of his own anonymous 'Tales of My Landlord' in the 'Quarterly Review' of January 1817, he had boldly asserted: 'The characters of Shakespeare are not more exclusively human, not more perfectly men and women as they live and move, than those of this mysterious author.'

Scott's taste for Shakespeare and for the theatre was formed in his childhood. When only four years old he was taken by his uncle, Captain Robert Scott, to see a performance of 'As You Like It' at Bath. At the age of eight, while staying at Prestonpans, he was first taught to read and understand Shakespeare by George Constable of Craigie-Wallace, one of the prototypes of Jonathan Oldbuck in 'The Antiquary.' As a result of these introductions to the dramatist, there followed an insatiable passion for Shakespeare in which he was greatly encouraged by his mother, a lady with literary taste uncommon among the sex of her time. It is not surprising, therefore, that we hear of him, at twelve years old, finding in his mother's dressing-room (in the Scotts' Edinburgh house) some odd volumes of Shakespeare, which he sat up reading with rapture by firelight till late at night.

Scott must surely have had that wonderful experience in mind as he recalled his delicate boyhood when describing the character of Wilfrid in these lines from Canto I of 'Rokeby':

' Hour after hour he loved to pore
On Shakespeare's rich and varied lore,
But turn'd from martial scenes and light,
From Falstaff's feast and Percy's fight,
To ponder Jaques' moral strain,
And muse with Hamlet, wise in vain;
And weep himself to soft repose
O'er gentle Desdemona's woes.'

But, in addition to the reading of drama, one of Scott's favourite pastimes at this age was private theatricals in his parents' Edinburgh house. At these productions, performed in the dining-room, Scott was always the manager, and when 'Richard III' was put on Scott would play the part of the king, for he thought his limp (caused by his lame leg) 'would do well enough to represent the hump.'

This early familiarity with Shakespeare naturally led to deeper and wider study of the subject, and it is clear that in subsequent years Scott not only ransacked a large territory of Shakespeare literature, but he ranged through most of the Elizabethan dramatists as well. Here is what he wrote to Sarah Smith, the actress, in 1811: 'When your professional studies will permit, pray have Shakespeare and the Dramatists of that golden age of theatrical genius as often in your hand as you can. There are no writings which tend so much to lay open the recesses of the human heart,* and to develop the workings of those passions which it is your business to represent.'

Scott's knowledge of Shakespeare can also be traced in the apt and scattered quotations with which, from his capacious memory, he illustrated points in his conversation, in his letters, and in his 'Journal.' 'When I want to express a sentiment which I feel strongly,' he remarked, 'I find the phrase in Shakespeare or Burns.'

But the richest gleanings from this Shakespeare knowledge are to be found in two divisions of his works: in some of the imaginative fiction and in certain of the editorial publications. The Waverley Novels contain over two hundred Shakespeare quotations. These became more frequent after Scott, in 'Guy Mannering' and 'The Antiquary,' adopted mottoes for chapter headings. Most of the headings in these two novels are from plays, of which eighteen Shakespeare plays are represented by twenty-nine quotations; and even in that late novel 'Anne of Geierstein' ten Shakespeare plays are drawn upon for fourteen quotations.

* Scott's phrase, 'recesses of the human heart,' had been also used, in commenting on Shakespeare, by James Thomson (the poet of 'The Seasons') in the Prologue to his play 'Tancred and Sigismunda':

'Thrice happy! could we catch great Shakespeare's art,
To trace the deep recesses of the heart.'

More attractive still are those interpolated lyrics scattered throughout the novels that burst forth spontaneously. In them Scott captures the Elizabethan song magic, as, for example, 'Twist ye, twine ye! even so' (in 'Guy Mannering'), 'Proud Maisie is in the wood' (in 'The Heart of Midlothian'), 'Love wakes and weeps' (in 'The Pirate'), 'Ah! County Guy, the hour is nigh' (in 'Quentin Durward'), and 'An hour with thee' (in 'Woodstock'). That Scott had a peculiar affinity with, and a warm affection for, the Elizabethan lyric form can be inferred from these words in his 'Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad' (1830). Referring to a natural expectation that facility of versification and poetic diction would occur in an era so imaginative as the Elizabethan, he observes: 'We may cite Shakespeare's unquestionable and decisive evidence in this respect. In "Twelfth Night" he describes a popular ballad with a beauty and precision which no one but himself could have affixed to its character. . . . The song ["Come away, come away, death"] is sung by Festé the clown. It differs . . . from what we might have been justified in considering as attributes of a popular ballad of that early period. . . . It is rather a love song than a minstrel ballad.'

In the substance of four of the Waverley Novels we find further results of Scott's knowledge of Shakespeare. His 1830 Introduction to 'The Monastery' discusses Lyly's 'Euphuies' and Euphuism, pays tribute to Shakespeare's Ariel, and cites Shakespeare's characters 'formed on the extravagances of temporary fashion,' namely, the Euphuist Don Armado, the pedant Holofernes, Nym, Pistol, and Mercutio. This discussion was called forth in consequence of the poor effect which Sir Piercie Shafton in the novel had had upon readers. Evidently 'the pearls of rhetoric which Sir Piercie scattered around him with such bounteous profusion' were bound to pall on readers. 'Doubt not that thy faithful Affability will be more commoved by the speech of this rudesby, than the bright and serene moon is perturbed by the baying of the cottager, proud of the height of his own dunghill, which, in his conceit, lifteth him nearer unto the majestic luminary.' Or, 'I am she, O most bucolical juvenal, under whose charge are placed the milky mothers of the herd.' Such Euphuistic affectations, although quite in character with

the conception of Sir Piercie, became tedious with repetition to contemporary readers, as they so become to those of the present day.

Although the whole of 'Kenilworth' is suffused with Scott's romantic interpretation of Elizabethan manners and expressions, the only direct references to Shakespeare are confined to Chapters Seventeen and Eighteen. You may remember how, at a loss for appropriate language in which to speak to Tressilian, Queen Elizabeth impatiently resorts to the poetry of 'that archknave Shakespeare . . . a plague on him, his toys come into my head when I should think of other matters.' Then there is the Earl of Leicester's greeting to Shakespeare himself, whom he finds among the spectators as he hurries from the Queen's council-chamber. 'Ha, Will Shakespeare—wild Will!—thou hast given my nephew, Philip Sidney, love-powder—he cannot sleep without thy Venus and Adonis under his pillow! We will have thee hanged for the veriest wizard in Europe.' As the royal barge proceeds on the Thames, Elizabeth recalls a petition from Orson Pinnit, keeper of the royal bears, who, as she informs the Earl of Sussex, 'complains that amidst the extreme delight with which men haunt the playhouses, and in especial their eager desire for seeing the exhibitions of one Will Shakespeare (whom, I think, my lords, we have all heard something of), the manly amusement of bear-baiting is falling into comparative neglect.' The Earl of Leicester's comment is: 'When men are agape to see how Marlowe, Shakespeare, and other play artificers, work out their fanciful plots, as they call them, the mind of the spectators is withdrawn from the conduct of their rulers.'

Of course, as most Scott readers know, the introduction of Shakespeare at court in 1575 is an anachronism, intentional or otherwise. Indeed, the dramatist was only eleven years old at that date. But, before leaving 'Kenilworth,' I should like to draw attention to the quaint apostrophe used by Michael Lambourne when he speaks to the Countess of Leicester. He addresses her as 'most lovely Countess of clouts, and divine Duchess of dark corners.' This, I think, has a special Shakespeare interest, for it seems that the second phrase may have been suggested by Shakespeare's 'Duke of dark corners' in 'Measure for Measure.'

Scott's indebtedness to a knowledge of Shakespeare and his time is also plainly evident in 'The Fortunes of Nigel.' It is seen at the very beginning, in the Introductory Epistle, where the Author of 'Waverley' and Captain Clutterbuck engage in dialogue. The Author not only alludes to Ariel as Shakespeare's 'most delicate creation,' but he entertains the captain with an amusing encounter he had with the ghost of Betty Barnes, who told him she was cook maid to John Warburton, the antiquary, and destroyed his large collection of Elizabethan plays. Scott must have revelled in reproducing her confession in these words. 'Yes, stranger, it was these ill-fated hands that consigned to grease and conflagration the scores of small quartos . . . it was these unhappy pickers and stealers that singed fat fowls and wiped dirty trenchers with the lost works of Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger, Jonson, Webster—what shall I say?—even of Shakespeare himself!'

The fourth and last Waverley Novel in which the knowledge of Shakespeare is discernible is 'Woodstock,' largely on account of old Sir Henry Lee's frequent quotations from the dramatist. You may remember that after his first quotation (the Earl of Northumberland's speech to Lady Percy in the Second Part of 'Henry IV,' Act II, sc. 3):

' Gentle daughter,
Give even way unto my rough affairs ;
Put you not on the temper of the times,
Nor be, like them, to Percy troublesome,'

his daughter, Alice Lee, comments : ' I am glad to hear you quote your favourite again, sir. Our little jars are ever wellnigh ended when Shakespeare comes in play.'

' His book was the closet-companion of my blessed master,' said Sir Henry ; ' after the Bible (with reverence for naming them together) he felt more comfort in it than in any other ; and as I have shared his disease, why, it is natural I should take his medicine.' But the old man adds ingenuously : ' I pretend not to my master's art in explaining the dark passages ; for I am but a rude man, and rustically brought up to arms and hunting.'

But these imaginative variations on the Elizabethan theme which I have cited by no means constitute all Scott's ramifications in Shakespeare literature. Two of his editorial works, or those which he supervised and sponsored,

contain his most critical writings on dramatic literature with intermittent commentaries on Shakespeare and one or two other Elizabethan playwrights. In this connection I should like to say that it is regrettable Scott's criticism has continued to be so greatly overshadowed by his creative work, for, if we discount his natural tendency to over-generous praise and some minor weaknesses, we shall find that in the main body of his criticism the critical faculty has been developed to a degree seldom evinced by a writer of such prodigious creation. His edition of Dryden (1808) and his essay on 'Drama' in the Supplement to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (1819) reveal both his qualities and his defects as critic and scholar. Of interest for our present purpose, however, are the passages where he discusses Shakespeare.

Confessing to an ignorance of stage-craft—'I know as little about the division of a drama as the spinster about the division of a battle'—Scott, like Sir Henry Lee's master, favoured reading Shakespeare in the closet rather than seeing him performed in the theatre. Though it be true that any play with the advantages of costume and other accessories approaches more nearly to reality, still, says Scott, 'it may remain a doubtful question whether, with all these means and appliances, minds of a high poetic temperature may not receive a more lively impression from the solitary perusal than from representation of one of Shakespeare's plays.' In 1817, when counselled by Scott to give up all idea of writing for the stage, M. W. Hartstonge was told: 'I have seen plays written by play actors succeed upon the stage merely as it seemed to me by practical or rather technical experience . . . the dialogue and interest of which was much inferior to the elegy of Cock Robin and the dramatis personæ not half so interesting as that in the House that Jack built.' And, in 1820, to Allan Cunningham, the Scots miscellaneous writer, he declared: 'We certainly do not always read with the greatest pleasure those plays which act best.' At the same time, Scott had little use for dry-as-dust scholars. 'Antiquaries,' he humorously remarks in his essay on 'Romance,' 'are apt to be both positive and polemical upon the very points which are least susceptible of proof, and which are least valuable if the truth could be ascertained; and which, therefore, we would gladly have seen handled with more

diffidence and better temper in proportion to their uncertainty.'

In his note to Dryden's 'All for Love' he seeks a parallel between that play and Shakespeare's 'Antony and Cleopatra,' asserting that Dryden's play is to be preferred 'in point of coherence, unity, and simplicity,' but in other respects it is inferior. 'The awful ruin of grandeur, undermined by passion, and tottering to its fall, is far more striking in the Antony of Shakespeare,' and in Dryden's Cleopatra 'there is greatly less spirit and originality than in Shakespeare's.' Nevertheless, Dryden's *inferior* characters 'are better supported than in Shakespeare.' Then, in contrasting the beauties of diction and style in both plays, Scott quotes the respective descriptions of Cleopatra's voyage down the Cydnus, his judgment deciding in favour of Dryden chiefly for 'the beauty of the language and imagery, which is flowery without diffusiveness, and rapturous without hyperbole. I fear Shakespeare cannot be exculpated from the latter fault . . . it is by sifting his beauties from his conceits that his imitator has been enabled to excel him.' Alluding in his 'Life of Dryden' to these remarks, Scott thinks that if they are just, 'we must allow Dryden the praise of greater regularity of plot, and a happier combination of scene; but in sketching the character of Antony he loses the majestic and heroic tone which Shakespeare has assigned him.' He has less good to say of Dryden's refitting of Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' for the stage, doubting if Dryden had improved it in the process.

The 'Encyclopædia Britannica' article on 'Drama,' signed 'N. N.,' is well worth examination not only for its extensive survey of the subject, but as another instance of the use to which Scott put his knowledge of Shakespeare. After referring, in a somewhat conventional strain, to Shakespeare as 'that powerful magician whose art could fascinate us even by means of deformity itself,' he points out how the English stage was without rule and model until Shakespeare arose. 'The effect of the genius of an individual upon the taste of a nation is mighty,' he argues; 'but that genius, in its turn, is formed according to the opinions prevalent at the period when it comes into existence. Such was the case with Shakespeare. . . . He followed the path which a nameless crowd of obscure

writers had trodden before him ; but he moved in it with the grace and majestic step of a being of a superior order ; and vindicated for ever the British theatre from a pedantic restriction to classical rule.'

When conveying the impression of contrast one obtains in reading Ben Jonson and Shakespeare, Scott's summary of Shakespeare's writing methods might well be applied to his own. Whereas, he remarks, Jonson was a slow writer, Shakespeare 'appears to have composed rapidly and carelessly ; and, sometimes, even without considering, while writing the earlier acts, how the catastrophe was to be huddled up, in that which was to conclude the piece.' How often has Scott been taken to task for haste, carelessness, and the huddling up of his plots in the novels !

But Scott has more to say about Shakespeare's advent in two passages of striking eloquence. 'The sun of Shakespeare arose almost without a single gleam of intervening twilight ; and it was no wonder that the audience, introduced to this enchanting and seductive art at once, under such an effulgence of excellence, should have been more disposed to wonder than to criticise ; to admire—or rather to adore—than to measure the height, or ascertain the course of the luminary which diffused such glory around him.' And again, recalling that David Garrick led back the public taste to Shakespeare's dramas : 'The plays of this great author had been altogether forgotten, or so much marred and disguised by interpolations and alterations, that he seems to have arisen on the British stage with the dignity of an antique statue disencumbered from the rubbish in which it had been enveloped since the decay of the art.'

At about the same time as these excursions in dramatic criticism were appearing, Scott entered upon editorial work on the drama in a supervisory capacity. Although the editorship of the three-volume edition of 'The Ancient British Drama' (1810) has been *doubtfully* attributed to Scott, it is certain he had some interest in the production. Shakespeare is excluded, but among the chosen specimens are Marlowe's 'Edward II' and 'The Jew of Malta,' Marston's 'The Malcontent,' and Webster's 'The Duchess of Malfi.' Scott considered Webster one of the best of our older dramatists, and it was at his particular request that 'The Duchess of Malfi' was inserted in this edition.

Recommending Lady Stafford to read the play, he informed her that it contains 'an odd and in some degree a terrific mixture of what is wild and extravagant with the simple, pathetic, and even childish. . . . I often light upon passages in these old neglected dramatists which, from the very strange and unexpected manner in which they are introduced, make the very blood tingle.' One doubts if Scott wrote the Preface to this collection, especially as it states: 'Coarse and indelicate passages may be found by those who love to glean for them; but the general tenour of our more ancient Plays is highly virtuous.'

A companion collection, a five-volume one of 'The Modern British Drama' (1811), has three brief Introductions which read as though they had been composed by Scott. Again Shakespeare is omitted, this time the reason being that it is presumed his plays are in the hands of every lover of the drama. The collection is grouped into: two volumes of tragedies with an Introduction, 'Remarks on English Tragedy'; two volumes of comedies with an Introduction, 'Remarks on English Comedy'; and a last volume, operas and farces, with an Introduction, 'Remarks on English Opera and Farce.'

Meanwhile Scott had been assisting Henry Weber, his amanuensis, in his fourteen-volume edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, a careless piece of work (as it turned out to be) published in 1812. The marginal notes Scott had made on his own copy of Beaumont and Fletcher were used by Weber, and Scott was ever ready to give his opinion on any portion of the work submitted to his judgment. Then in October 1810 he proposed to his printer, James Ballantyne, an edition of Shakespeare 'with a text as accurate as Weber and you can make it . . . and a selection of notes from former editions with some original commentaries, exclusive of all trash . . . I should be willing to take a few plays under my particular inspection.' But as Ballantyne had not profited much from a twelve-volume Shakespeare he had issued in 1807, it was not likely he would venture on another so soon again. However, in 1819 he printed for Messrs Hurst, Robinson and Co. the plays in two double-columned volumes, which Scott considered 'a beautiful book,' but in the editing of which he had no hand.

It was another of Scott's unfulfilled projects, however,
Vol. 290.—No. 593.

which eventually brought about the most interesting, though uncompleted, edition of Shakespeare. As far back as 1805 he had approached Archibald Constable, the publisher, with a gigantic scheme for a new edition of the British Poets, and although the plan fell through, the idea of it recurred from time to time until, on Feb. 15, 1822, Constable proposed as a substitute that Scott should edit a Shakespeare. It was to consist of twelve or fourteen volumes with readable and amusing notes. There would be an introductory volume, giving a survey of Shakespeare's life, writings, and times as well as an account of previous editors' labours.

As it happened, Constable's proposal came at an opportune moment, for Scott was then engaged in correspondence with Johann Heinrich Voss, a German translator of Shakespeare, who, with his sons Heinrich and Abraham, was bringing out 'Shakespeares Schauspiele' in nine volumes (1818-1829). In the course of a letter to Voss, Scott propounded these views on the Shakespeare text. 'I agree entirely with you that the Commentators of Shakespeare have overburthened the text with notes and disputes trivial in themselves and not always conducted either with taste or temper. . . . The great fault seems to be that they must & will have every thing completely & accurately explained without considering that Shakespeare like all other poets who write in a hurry very frequently uses a form of words the meaning of which is clear enough when the full sentence is considered although it may be very difficult to dissect the sentence grammatically and apply the special and separate meaning to each branch or word in it. . . . I think to read Shakespeare luxuriously one should use two copies, the one for perusal altogether without notes and the other a full edition cum notis variorum to consult upon any point of difficulty or interest.'

There, then, we have the attitude Scott adopted towards Constable's projected edition. He replied to him on Feb. 25, 1822: 'A Shakespeare, to say truth, has been often a favourite scheme with me—a sensible Shakespeare in which the useful & readable notes should be condensed and separated from the trash. . . . I think it a desideratum in English literature.'

By October he thinks even more favourably of the plan, for he finds he could conduct it without interfering

with his other engagements and he counts on having Lockhart as collaborator on account of his skill in philology. 'The only novelty I could give,' he writes, 'would be by availing myself of the various foreign commentators who have now exercised their ingenuity upon Shakespeare & many, as Schlegel particularly, with considerable success. . . . Perhaps if I were to try a play or two by way of experiment you could better judge what was like to come of it. I have most of the books that would be necessary.'

In February 1823 Constable sent an estimate with specimen sheets of 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona' to Scott and to his own partner, Robert Cadell, informing the latter that 'it would be one of the best things we ever undertook. . . . His [Scott's] head is full of Shakespeare. . . . He would write an Octavo Volume on Shakespeare in three months any time—perhaps in half that period.' The edition, now changed to ten volumes, would be freely interspersed with notes, and the first volume, containing Shakespeare's Life, was to be the last printed. Cadell, replying the next day, insists that unless Scott's name be attached to the publication, it will not be worth the paper and print, and that another three-volume Scott novel will be more profitable. He is not against the Shakespeare, but against it without Scott's name, adding: 'If he lives we shall get Shakespeare.' On March 17, 1824, he writes to Scott, reiterating that, though favourably disposed to the scheme, he does not wish Scott's succession of novels to be interrupted by this undertaking.

Scott's share in the editing, as he informs Hartstonge on March 26, 'is scarce worth mentioning, being only the condensing the little which is known of Shakespeare and the quantity of information we possess of his time into a popular and readable shape, in short the object is to make a deep and at the same time an interesting impression on the public.' Apparently Lockhart shouldered the main task, which he seems to have pursued with avidity that spring.

Throughout 1826, however, progress fluctuated, largely owing to the effects of Constable's bankruptcy, the project ranking as the eighth claim brought against Scott's estate 'for fulfillment of the Agreement on the part of Sir Walter Scott respecting the Edition of Shakespeare.' It was stipulated to pay Scott about 1,500*l.* for his prefatory Life,

while Lockhart had already received 100*l.* for his part of the work. In the summer, as the correspondence divulges, three volumes are printed at press, viz. Vols. II, III, and IV, but the adverse state of Constable's firm induces Cadell not only to delay publication but to think of issuing the edition in monthly volumes, as had been done with Bacon's Works and some of the English divines, instead of bringing it out as a complete work. To John George Cochrane, the bookseller, he reports on July 14: 'The notes by Lockhart are very good—the book is most beautiful. . . . I think the 1000 copies would sell off in Volumes. . . . Sir Walter Scott's single volume on Shakespeare would sell well by itself. . . . I know there are many, too many Shakespeares, but still I have a notion that Sir W. Scott's will do.'

Four months elapse, and then in spring 1827 Scott, suggesting that Gifford's Shakespeareana might be blended with their edition, tells Lockhart that 'Cadell is eternally talking about Shakespeare' so that it is possible 'he might get out some of the volumes almost immediately'; he himself could finish the *Life* in a year.

The subject is not mentioned, however, for almost two years, and then on Feb. 23, 1830, Lockhart, losing interest in the concern, suggests to Scott the employment of a substitute for his (Lockhart's) 'humble department.' He adds that Cadell, although willing, is not zealous to complete the bargain of his predecessor (i.e. Constable, lately deceased). 'Meantime Murray is quite anxious to take up the thing in case you wish it to go on & Cadell wd rather avoid it, & wd gladly buy the vols already printed at any fair rate.' Scott's reply on March 3 are the last words on the matter during his and Lockhart's lifetime. 'Shakespeare can lie over for the present.'

That Cadell did purchase the three printed volumes I have not been able to ascertain, but it seems that after his death in 1849 they were put up for sale in Edinburgh and bought, it is said, by Thomas Rodd, a London bookseller, although Constable's son, Thomas Constable, doubted if one copy was in existence in the seventies. But Justin Winsor, writing to the 'Boston Advertiser' of March 21, 1874, and referring to Dr James Wynne's account of the Thomas P. Barton Collection in the Boston Public Library, observed that 'they are perhaps the only ones of the

edition now in existence.' Andrew Lang, when producing his 'Life of Lockhart' in the late nineties, remarked: 'The fate of "the Shakespeare" remains a literary mystery. One would have expected to find copies of the three volumes, finished, at Abbotsford,' to which the late Dr W. S. Crockett, in an article in the 'Bookman' of December 1921, added: 'The copies are not at Abbotsford, as I can testify.' But, as a fact, one copy of Vol. II had actually lain undiscovered in Scott's study at Abbotsford until 1933, when it was acquired from Major-General Sir Walter Maxwell Scott, Bart., by the National Library of Scotland, where it is now preserved. As neither the British Museum nor the Bodleian at Oxford possess any of the three volumes, this copy of Vol. II is the only volume of the Scott-Lockhart Shakespeare in the country.

Published in octavo, the copy has neither title-page nor publication date, but the book is designated Vol. II on the half-title of the first and last play, there being four plays with half-titles, which run: 'Two Gentlemen of Verona,' 'Comedy of Errors,' 'Love's Labour's Lost,' and 'The Merchant of Venice.'

I have space to quote only three of the footnotes as specimens. 'The Two Gentlemen,' Act III, sc. 1: '*And where I thought the remnant of mine age—Where*, in this and in innumerable instances, has the sense of *whereas*—a use of the word still retained in the legal phraseology of Scotland.' 'Love's Labour's Lost,' Act v, sc. 2: '*While greasy Joan doth keel the pot—Keel* is only the Anglo-Saxon pronunciation of *cool*, still retained in some provinces. Dr Goldsmith said, that "to *keel* the pot" was still, in his time, a common expression in Ireland for "to *scum* the pot"; which is, indeed, akin to cooling it, since it prevents its boiling over. Mr Steevens, however, says, "Mr Lambe observes, in his notes on the ancient metrical History of 'The Battle of Flodden,' that it is a common thing in the North 'for a maid-servant to take out of a boiling pot a *ween*, i.e. a small quantity, of broth, and then to fill up the pot with cold water. The broth thus taken out is called the *keeling ween*. In this manner greasy Joan keeled the pot.'" 'The Merchant of Venice,' Act IV, sc. 1: '*A woollen bag-pipe—*The bag of the pipe is almost always covered with cloth. Dr Johnson, however, read *wooden*; and Sir J. Hawkins more happily

swollen ; which last conjecture Steevens admitted into his text.' In the 'New Cambridge Shakespeare' edition a note says that in addition to these conjectures 'Capell conjectured "wawling," of which the Cambridge edd. of 1863 approved. The text is, nevertheless, undoubtedly correct: the "bags" are quite commonly wrapped in baize or flannel.'

After examining this copy of Volume II, the question that comes uppermost to one's mind is, did Scott ever write his Life of Shakespeare, or even part of it? If so, one would give a good deal to see it, for perhaps it might set out as never before Scott's knowledge of the supreme genius. Who knows? It may be lurking in some unsuspected hiding-place and may come to light in the future.

Scott's interest in the Elizabethans continued unabated to the end of his life. In 1831, only a year before his death, he wrote to the Rev. Alexander Dyce, the editor of some Elizabethan dramatists, about his intention of contributing an article to the 'Quarterly Review' on Peele, Greene, and Webster, but that article was never written owing to Scott's last illness.

W. M. PARKER.

Art. 6.—FROM CRADLE TO GRAVE.

IF there is any truth at all left in the saying that an Englishman's home is his castle, there should be a rider explaining that a drawbridge has been permanently lowered to admit the passage under the portcullis of a long stream of official visitors. At a conference held recently in one town to discuss a so-called problem family, more than a dozen persons were present who at one time or another had all visited the home in a professional capacity; they included the Children's Officer, the Health Visitor, the School Nurse, the Housing Manager, the Probation Officer, representatives of other statutory bodies such as Health Insurance and National Assistance, and of several voluntary organisations. All these people in solemn conclave may have succeeded in improving conditions in that particular bug-infested household, or they may not. Probably the best form of help for dirty and feckless families is given by the Family Service Units, a voluntary association whose members roll up their sleeves and scrub the floor in a spirit of neighbourly friendship. Some of the Children's Officers, who have to deal with the offspring of irresponsible parents, would like to see such work extended under statutory bodies, but personal service of this kind demands a saintly spirit of devotion which does not necessarily inspire every social worker.

Problem families are fortunately in a minority, representing only a very small proportion of the population as a whole. How does the normal self-respecting family react to the increase of multiple visiting which, with its overlapping and consequent waste of time and energy, is so irritating a feature of the Welfare State? A magistrate was recently reported to have said of a family whose children were brought before the court as being in need of care and protection owing to lack of living accommodation, that 'the only reason they are before the Court is because the different departments of the Local Authorities in the County can only co-ordinate their activities through this Court' (Mr Dunnico, Stratford Juvenile Court, Essex, 'News Chronicle,' Nov. 2, 1951). There certainly are many authorities in separate departmental compartments who may all be dealing with the same person at different stages, or even at the same time; for the Welfare State, from

family allowances to funeral expenses, is intimately concerned with the seven ages of man.

First the infant, in the Health Visitor's arms. The National Health Service provides a free medical service for the entire nation, and unifies all hospital administration—except the teaching hospitals—under fourteen Regional Boards ; actually, the service is no longer wholly free, as in the present condition of the national economy it has been found necessary to impose certain charges for prescriptions and so on. There has been no interference with the duties laid upon local authorities, which include responsibility for maternity and child welfare. 'It shall be the duty of every local health authority to make arrangements for the care, including in particular dental care, of expectant and nursing mothers and of children who have not attained the age of five years and are not attending primary schools maintained by a local education authority' (National Health Service Act, Part III, Section 22). This care includes the provision of midwives, home nurses, domestic help where necessary, and also health visitors 'for the purpose of giving advice as to the care of young children, persons suffering from illness and expectant or nursing mothers, and as to the measures necessary to prevent the spread of infection' (Section 24).

As the infant grows older he may attend day-nurseries under the control of the local authority or a nursery-school under the education authority. It is greatly to be regretted that some of the latter are being closed down under the new economy cuts, for all little children, especially those in cramped homes with busy mothers, require the care and space which in the past were given as of right in the nurseries of the well-to-do. Later on, when the infant has passed out of the nursery stage, he comes, with his satchel and shining morning face, entirely under the control of the education authority, which is responsible not only for teaching him but for having him medically inspected, fed and even clothed if necessary, and for sending him to boarding-school if, for one reason or another, this is thought to be desirable.

Deprived children come under the special care of the local authority. The term is used for all children who are deprived of a normal home background for any cause, whether through desertion, a broken family, cruelty,

neglect, or merely some passing difficulty such as illness, which makes it temporarily impossible for parents to look after their own children. More than 124,000 children come into this category, without allowing for those who may be neglected or ill-treated within their own homes, pitiful cases like those reported from time to time in the press. In 1950 the N.S.P.C.C. prosecuted in 647 cases, and those are inevitably the grossest among the 100,000 or so cases of children brought to their notice. Public opinion in this matter was aroused by the Curtis Report, and under the Children Act of 1948 County and County Borough Councils have to provide a comprehensive service for 'the care or welfare, up to the age of eighteen . . . of boys and girls when they are without parents or have been lost or abandoned by, or are living away from, their parents, or when their parents are unfit or unable to take care of them' (Preamble). These children are either placed in Homes run by the local authority or by a voluntary organisation, or else they are boarded out with foster-parents. In that case they must be visited regularly by an official called Boarding-out or Children's Officer, who has—or should have—the gift of making friends tactfully with child and foster-mother alike. Payment for the child includes clothing allowance and pocket-money, nor are Christmas and birthday presents forgotten. It can be a normal happy life for the foster-child if he becomes genuinely part of the family, with no inferiority feelings towards the other children of the household; but if the foster-mother is not sensible and kind he may be more contented in an institution, among contemporaries who share his fate. Cottage Homes for mixed ages and sexes, where children can attend the local school, seem to provide as good a solution for this problem as is to be found.

Delinquent children present difficulties which have not yet been satisfactorily solved. A Committee appointed recently by the Home Office to review such matters as punishments in Approved Schools reports that at present a difficult child may come under any one of three departments, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health, or the Home Office. It recommends that an inter-departmental committee should be set up to prevent overlapping, and also that there should be special schools set apart for those delinquent children who are backward or subnormal.

The Ministry of Education is concerned with education in its fullest sense, with out-of-school activities as well as with classroom teaching. There are local Youth Committees and frequently also a local Youth Organiser, to develop recreational possibilities for adolescents and sometimes also for younger children. They encourage existing Youth Centres or Clubs and found new ones, train Youth Leaders in classes or in short residential courses, and arrange drama competitions, sports, choirs and bands, discussion groups, and so on. In one sample town with a population of nearly 150,000 there are more than 300 Youth Groups of one kind or another, with a membership of 15,000, which seems to include most of the new generation. Whether lack of personal initiative, replaced by official guidance, helps the training for citizenship is of course another matter.

At school-leaving age insurance becomes compulsory under the National Insurance Act, and all insured persons are divided into classes, Employed, Self-employed, and Non-employed. The Act was established in order to provide 'pecuniary payments by way of unemployment benefit, sickness benefit, maternity benefit, retirement pension, widows' benefit, guardians' allowance and death grant.' For the first time housewives are recognised as a distinct class, for 'a woman over pensionable age shall be entitled to a retirement pension by virtue of the insurance of her husband' (Section 21). Statutory benefit for maternity is available to the unmarried as well as to the married mother; the former, if insured, may also receive a maternity allowance for thirteen weeks before and after her confinement, to which the married woman is not entitled unless she is herself insured as a wage-earner; on the other hand, it is obvious that a mother who has no husband is in more urgent need of immediate help. In cases where insurance payments are inadequate they may be supplemented under the National Assistance Act, which now supersedes the old Poor Law. The former hated Means Test is applied under the name of Needs Test, and no longer includes demands on independent wage-earning members of the family, who are not expected to contribute more to the general budget than they would naturally do as lodgers. Relief in kind is still permissible, and help may also be given for such special needs as extra

nourishment in illness. An area officer of the National Assistance Board and a staff of visiting officers replace the former Public Assistance Committee and the relieving officer, payment now being made through the Post Office. There are so many different unco-ordinated departments that it is possible for one family to have several pay-books—insurance, family allowance, and so on.

Under the Act, welfare services for the disabled are to be provided by local authorities. The blind have always benefited more by protective legislation than other physically handicapped persons, perhaps because it is easier to imagine the horror of darkness than the isolation of the deaf or the psychological problems of the crippled. Education for the blind has long been compulsory: pensions were given at an earlier age, and the duty of caring for them was already laid upon local authorities by the Blind Persons Act of 1920. This has now been superseded by the National Assistance Act with its comprehensive clause, enumerating 'persons who are blind, deaf or dumb, and other persons who are substantially and permanently handicapped by illness, injury, or congenital deformity or such other disabilities as may be prescribed by the Minister' (Part III, Section 29). There is also a permissive clause dealing with sheltered employment, instruction and recreational facilities. The Welfare State aims at integrating the physically handicapped person into the working community, which is desirable above all for his own sake; but because of the shortage of accommodation in educational and other institutions, the means fall far short of the intention. There are still long waiting-lists and much avoidable suffering, and there is also some wasteful overlapping. Joan Simeon Clarke, in her admirable book 'Disabled Citizens,' says in the chapter on Tuberculosis: 'This multiplicity of aid means that the tuberculous cannot feel neglected in any but the most negligent of counties. It also means that many different persons may be calling at the same house. It is possible, but not probable, for the following persons all to have reasons for calling, all in the interest of the patient: Tuberculosis Medical Officer, Sanitary Inspector, Health Visitor, Tuberculosis Almoner, representative of Care Committee, Assistance Board Officer, Occupational Therapist, members of Red Cross and W.V.S.'

The National Assistance Act also deals in general with the duty of local authorities to provide accommodation. Under Part Three of the Act they are to provide:

'(a) residential accommodation for persons who by reason of age, infirmity or any other circumstances are in need of care and attention which is not otherwise available to them;

(b) temporary accommodation for persons who are in urgent need thereof, being need arising in circumstances which could not reasonably have been foreseen or in such other circumstances as the authority may in any particular case determine' (Part III, Section 21).

Consequently, slippered ease has at last become possible, in theory at least, during the final stage of the seven ages of man. There is not even any need to exist sans eyes and teeth, since dentures and spectacles can be supplied in cases of hardship. Under the above Act former Poor Law Institutions are being transformed and new Homes built for old people. They are bright and pleasant, well adapted to the needs of the aged; payment may be four guineas a week for those who can afford it, or a guinea for those who draw the old age pension. Tobacco or sweets are provided, and clothing replacements and shoe repairs are also available free, if necessary. There are few rules, occasional treats, and a general atmosphere of friendliness; and where the sexes are mixed, a sudden courtship may colour the daily monotony with an exciting gleam of romance. The picture looks attractive, but there is a flaw in the canvas on which it is painted, even apart from the fact that there are far more applicants than vacancies in the ideal Homes, which are only available to a very small percentage of old people. According to the new regulations the aged come under two separate authorities, in other words a cut has been made clean through the human group in its final stage. If they are in need of care and attention they are the responsibility of the local authority under the National Assistance Act, but if they are ill they must be provided for under the National Health Act. In practice this means that old people may be sent away from the Home in which they had hoped to end their days, without guarantee of return; the hospital, on the other hand, with its shortage of beds, is interested chiefly in turning them out again as soon as may be.

Domiciliary help of various kinds is available under the Act, and voluntary service is officially encouraged. It is expressly laid down in the National Assistance Act that 'A local authority may make contributions to the funds of any voluntary organisation whose activities consist in or include the provision of recreation or meals for old people' (Section 31). A Ministry of Health Circular addressed to all local authorities in 1950 amplified this in the following extract: 'These services (voluntary) include the regular visiting of old people in their homes, and helping them with their shopping, in obtaining magazines and books from local libraries, with letter writing, with mending, and generally in solving minor domestic difficulties. Home visiting of this kind has been shown to be of particular value, for it can mitigate the sense of desolation and loneliness often experienced by these old people; can draw attention to those who need the benefit of other voluntary services . . . and can be so planned that information is passed to the appropriate local authority whenever it appears that some branch of their health or welfare services should be brought into action.'

What part do voluntary organisations in general play during the seven ages of man within the Welfare State? Some of them have so important a function that they have become as it were semi-official, receiving grants from the statutory authority, which frequently employs them as an agent. 'Voluntary societies perform an important health function by continuing their existing work as agents of or with grant-aid from the statutory authorities, and also in pioneer work for which they may or may not receive aid from the State. Amongst the well-known national bodies are the National Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, the British Council for the Disabled, the National Council for Maternity and Child Welfare, the National Association for Mental Health, the Central Council for the Care of Cripples, the National Institute for the Blind, and the National Institute for the Deaf. In the new pattern of social legislation a number of these are also concerned with the handicapped whose social welfare needs are dealt with under the National Assistance Act, the Disabled Persons (Employment) Act, and the Education Acts, except in so far as they may require the almoners' help if they are under hospital treatment'

(Carnegie Trust Survey of Social Work in Britain by Eileen L. Younghusband).

In an article of this kind it is not possible to mention more than a very few of the many voluntary organisations which are not concerned immediately with problems of health like the above. The religious bodies alone would run into several pages, from the Y.M.C.A. to the Salvation Army, from the Catholic Child Welfare Society to the Jewish Board of Guardians. Among all the agencies only a few are selected here at random: the Family Welfare Association (formerly the Charity Organisation Society), with its long experience of individual case-work; the Citizens' Advice Bureau, which supplies information on the complicated problems, legal and otherwise, which now confront the perplexed citizen; the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, whose very existence is an indictment of any civilised State; other diverse bodies like the Soldiers', Sailors', and Airmen's Families Association, the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies, and the Friends of the Poor. Some voluntary organisations give material aid, others give counsel, friendship, and personal service, which are altogether outside the scope of the State. How long are they all likely to continue in their present unofficial, or occasionally semi-official, capacity? It seems possible that some of them at any rate will in time be taken over and become wholly merged in the State. Statutory authorities may find it more economical to control all social welfare activities themselves, and they may also consider that the growing complexity of the work demands centralisation for the sake of greater efficiency. Finally, there is no doubt that the supply of voluntary workers will diminish in proportion to the general decrease in private means and leisure. The pressure of life to-day makes it ever more difficult for men and women to devote themselves to public service without payment, and the whole trend seems to be in the direction of preliminary training and subsequent full-time salaried work—in other words, towards professionalism.

If this forecast is correct, it is to be deplored. Mass welfare does not suit every individual; already the remarkable Peckham Health Centre has had to be closed down, because State funds were not available for any private

experiment, no matter how useful. Moreover, there is no particular reason to suppose that a paid official will always show greater sympathy and understanding than a devoted voluntary worker. If the philanthropist in the past was untrained and sometimes muddled, the official in the future may well become more and more self-important and bureaucratic. An enormous increase of minor officials is an outcome of the new regulations ; and the wide power of a petty bureaucracy is not by any means pleasant to contemplate.

Impassioned supporters of the Welfare State are sometimes inclined to forget that public concern for social welfare is not new, but has been developing steadily during the past half-century, and that many of the present measures were there before 1948. Thus, for example, although the wives and children of insured men were not entitled to free medical treatment before the passing of the National Health Service Act, many of them were already privately insured. In any case, the doctors' patients are at present far too many for thorough attention, the hospital waiting-lists seem to be longer than ever before, and the promised Health Centres are not there at all. Public assistance was given before the National Assistance Act, and the increased scale of payment is only in accordance with the general all-round increase in the cost of living. Sheltered employment was provided for under the Disabled Persons (Employment) Act of 1944, old age pensions, however inadequate, have been given since 1908, and so on. Nonetheless, it is undoubtedly true to say that all measures for social welfare have now been put in order and on the whole linked up with one another, and they have been increased and improved in the tidying-up process.

The housing shortage still continues in spite of everything, and there lies the root of most, if not of all, evil. It will not be improved by any change of name, even if we all sing, as Mr Churchill once suggested, ' Accommodation unit, sweet sweet accommodation unit ! ' No matter what homes are to be called, they must be produced as speedily as possible, even if they are only prefabricated. The faster houses go up, the sooner will many remediable social problems disappear, and as a result the need—perhaps even the desire—for State assistance will be considerably reduced. In the bad old days of the Industrial

Revolution, of squalor and hunger and slums, the State was like a cruel step-mother, exploiting the helpless. To-day a more appropriate image would be a figure of Santa Claus surrounded by an eager crowd waiting for their presents. It is true that all the gifts have been bought out of the citizens' own money, but some citizens have given more than others, and the final result is a general and not unjust redistribution of income. The best gift of the State is security, and it is a noble achievement on the part of England that she can assure this to all her people. 'The Times' recently published an account of a hundred case-histories of persons appealing for funds, which was given in the December supplement of the 'New York Times'; from an analysis of this list it appeared that in England only ten per cent. of these cases would have required private charity, as the remaining ninety per cent. could have claimed assistance as their right under the social services. That is indeed a matter for pride. Nevertheless, some changes are still desirable, both in administration and in principle, and the final aim should be to symbolise the State not as a benevolent donor with a bottomless sack, but as a friend on whom to rely in case of need.

DAISY L. HOBMAN.

Art. 7.—THE RELATION BETWEEN ETHICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.

ONE of the most urgent and important tasks facing us at the present time is the attempt to establish a reliable body of knowledge in the sphere of human life—individual and social. For too long the direction of human affairs has been at the mercy of opinion, prejudice, and concentrations of power; has been undertaken amid the complex influences of group interests, ideologies, and religious systems. Not all of this opinion and influence, of course, has been detrimental and unsound. On the contrary, we would expect *all* social ideas which emerge and gain influence in the affairs of men to contain *some* elements of truth—to be related to one or other of the deep-rooted needs of mankind; otherwise it is difficult to see why they should ever arise. Nevertheless, until—and including—the present day, men have never possessed a reliable body of knowledge concerning human nature and human society to which they could turn for guidance, by means of which they could test the doctrines and slogans of their leaders.

The desire to achieve such a body of established knowledge and the recognition of its importance have existed in the minds of men for some considerable time. The ancient Greeks, for example, were very much aware of the need for knowledge of the relations between men in society, as against opinion about them; and though, with a refined logic and scientific method at our disposal, we might question their methods of inquiry and their results, for them Philosophy was the 'love of *knowledge*,' and the extent to which they inquired into the general nature of things (including human nature and human society) and the extent to which they were successful, can, I think, never be too much admired. Since their time the world has seen a long and distinguished line of thinkers, too numerous to mention here, who have contributed in various ways to such knowledge of mankind as we now possess. Perhaps the first name to mention, for our purposes, is that of David Hume, who—after the notable successes of the Natural Sciences—was the first philosopher to attempt a clear statement of the relation between the Natural Sciences and the Science of Man, and to suggest the extension of scientific method to the study of mankind.

In his introduction to the 'Treatise of Human Nature,' Hume says :

' It is evident that all the sciences have a relation, greater or less, to Human Nature. . . . Here then is the only expedient, from which we can hope for success in our philosophical researches, to leave the tedious lingering method which we have hitherto followed, and, instead of taking now and then a castle or village on the frontier, to march up directly to the capital or centre of these sciences, to Human Nature itself ; which being once masters of, we may everywhere else hope for an easy victory. . . . There is no question of importance whose decision is not comprised in the Science of Man ; and there is none which can be decided with any certainty, before we become acquainted with that Science. In pretending, therefore, to explain the principles of Human Nature, we in effect propose a complete system of the Sciences, built on a foundation almost entirely new, and the only one upon which they can stand with any security.'

Even in this short passage, it is easy to see the direct link between Hume and the Positivism of Comte, with its hierarchy of sciences : mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, and—the new science, the crowning science of the whole edifice—*Sociology*. John Stuart Mill, in sympathy with Hume's idea of a Science of Man and much impressed by the work of Comte, produced—about the middle of the nineteenth century—his 'System of Logic,' which contains, as its final section, an application of the 'general logic of scientific inquiry' to the Social Sciences.

' I have indulged the hope,' concludes Mill, ' that to some of those on whom the task will devolve of bringing those most important of all sciences into a more satisfactory state, my observations may be useful. . . . Should this hope be realised, what is probably destined to be the great intellectual achievement of the next two or three generations of European thinkers will have been in some degree forwarded.'

The struggle with those problems which lie in the way of this 'great intellectual achievement' continues. Since the mid-nineteenth century a growing amount of attention and effort has been directed to the Social Sciences, and considerable progress has been made. In spite of this, however, there is still a widespread dissatisfaction with the state of the Social Sciences. Instead of a comprehensive

body of knowledge, we are presented with several specialist sciences which prove to be extremely difficult to fit together. Even within the separate sciences themselves, we meet with this same unsatisfactory state of fragmentation. Instead, for instance, of having a comprehensive science of Psychology, we have a number of separate 'schools' which are difficult to synthesise in any attempt to form an integrated theory. The Psycho-Analysts, indeed, are so distinctive that their terms can scarcely be translated into the general language of the other schools. Similarly, in the field of Social Psychology, one can pick up two text-books and find that the material dealt with in each hardly ever coincides—as though the books were dealing with two different subjects.

In view of the strict departmentalisation which has arisen, it is generally agreed that, whilst further specialist work will no doubt be of value, what is needed above all at the present time is a theoretical integration, in the light of existing material, which will give direction to the further questions which need to be asked. Karl Mannheim has commented strongly on the separation of the specialist sciences, which, he says, 'give us nothing but fragments, unnaturally torn out of their context.' 'Mere fact-finding has lasted long enough. . . . We must try to create a period of Theoretical Integration.'

One of the difficulties which stands in the way of such an integration is this problem of the relation between Ethics and Social Science. Man is an awkward creature to study, and not the least awkward because of this fact—that he makes moral judgments. It has become a habit of the social scientists (apart, perhaps, from the sociologists) merely to ignore this question, and yet it is certain that no satisfactory Social Science can exist until the problem is solved. In order to see the problem clearly, perhaps we might approach the Social Sciences from the viewpoint of the student (who has not yet been persuaded into the use of 'academic spectacles') and see how the place of morals in his field of study becomes a troublesome question for him.

The rigid separation of all the Social Sciences from each other, and the separation from all of these of Ethics.

Few students on first approaching the Social Sciences escape a feeling of dissatisfaction, and this dissatisfaction is

largely due to two striking features of which they are made aware at a very early stage in their inquiries. The first is : the apparently rigid separation of all the Social Sciences from each other. The second is : the rigid separation from all these of Ethics. Not only does the student feel a sense of disappointment on encountering this strict departmentalisation ; he is disturbed, also, to find in existence an active enmity, of varying degrees of intensity, between the authorities of each autonomous department. The economist, for instance, rules questions of Morals and Politics quite decisively out of the scope of his science. The student—perhaps naïve in that he visualises society as a whole ; perhaps confused in that he introduces moral feelings into his observations of economic behaviour ; but usually, nowadays, a very purposeful individual—has viewed the economic problems of his time as being of so much importance *simply because they are* so closely bound up with questions of morals, politics, and social justice ; and the rigid boundary-marking of the academic departments appears to him to be not only unrealistic, but also a little doubtful in its honesty ; a little weak. It seems that the scientists are going to teach their sciences without end, whilst the live issues of society are—a little guiltily—to be avoided ; or at least to be left to the poor ill-informed statesman, whom the scientists are so fond of criticising. It seems, if you like, more like a smoke-screen of science than a clear fresh wind of truth to sweep away the cobwebs of error.

The major separation, the student discovers, appears to be between the moral philosophers and the social scientists. The scientists leave Moral Philosophy severely alone : as though she were a lady of doubtful character who, once acknowledged, would spoil the neat pattern of their lives. The moral philosophers, a little injured and very dignified, talk a great deal about Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Butler, Mill, Kant, the Right and the Good, but never come round to relating these discussions to such matters as private property, the divorce laws, or the relation between employers and employees.

The questions which arise in the student's mind, then, are : Firstly, why does this estrangement and enmity exist ? Secondly : is it really necessary ? Is there really a ground for dispute ? And thirdly : why does everyone

fight shy of morality? Clearly, the student can only feel dissatisfied with what he finds because he expected to find something else. What was he expecting? Why did he come to a study of the Social Sciences?

Why, in fact, do we come to want a reliable Social Science?

Any answers we give to this simple question will, I think, be significantly revealing in that they invariably seem to contain moral elements. We may want a reliable body of knowledge concerning human nature and human society because:

Firstly, as individuals, we may wish to understand ourselves and our place in society correctly.

Secondly, we may be very much disturbed by certain social manifestations which seem evil and undesirable—such as crime, delinquency, war, poverty, international misunderstanding—and we may wish to try and uncover the causes of these things.

Thirdly, we may be puzzled by contradictions in the rules which we feel under some obligation to obey—such as: that we should defend our country against foreigners and that we should love our neighbour, when foreigners are included in our meaning of the term 'neighbour'—and we may wish to resolve this evident inconsistency in social ideals.

Fourthly, we may wish, by social, political, or economic action, to make certain improvements in society; and we see the need for an adequate knowledge of society on which to base our policy.

Fifthly, we may wish to test the accuracy and validity of those principles and slogans which are poured into our ears by the various political groups which are competing for our support.

This is a purely haphazard list of reasons, and no doubt a good many more, and better, reasons could be added. The point, however, which it is worthwhile to consider here is this: can we think of *any* reason which leads us to want a reliable Social Science which does *not* contain an element of Ethics? I suggest that most of our reasons do, in fact, contain moral elements. If this is so, it seems all the more puzzling that Ethics should be kept so completely outside the compact enclosures of the Social Sciences. If we are so prompted by motives of morality and justice, why

are morality and justice kept so successfully out of the picture ?

We shall return to this question later and see whether there is any good reason for this state of affairs. But at least we can see plainly why the student is dissatisfied on his first approach. Firstly, he sees society as an inter-related whole, and is offered, instead, an artificial set of parts with no suggestion as to how they should be fitted together ; and secondly, he is usually prompted to his study by genuine motives of social justice, but is told at the outset, quite clearly by his lecturers, that his study of the Social Sciences must be very careful to keep clear of just this element.

For the present, however, we might turn aside from the reasons why men come to the study of Social Science and ask ourselves the question :

What is the aim of Social Science, as such, and why does the question of Morals present such an outstanding difficulty ?

The aim of any science is to build up a systematic and reliable body of knowledge concerning the phenomena with which it deals, and to make this body of knowledge as complete as possible. A science describes and classifies its data, and seeks, and establishes as being true, those laws of association which hold between them. Social Science is no different from the Natural Sciences in these aims. It seeks to build up a full and reliable body of knowledge about human life—individual and social. Also, like the Natural Sciences, the test of its knowledge is prediction.

In the light of this aim, we might briefly consider one or two of the Social Sciences, and see how the existence of moral judgments in the life of mankind complicates their problem.

Firstly, we might take the case of a general social science, or Sociology. Here, the aim is to build up a reliable body of knowledge concerning *all* the complex interrelations of human beings in society. The science seeks to classify all factors having a direct or indirect bearing on these human interrelationships, as—for instance—physical environment and climate, economic resources, levels of technology, the size and structure (age-groups,

sex-groups, social classes) of populations, etc. It seeks laws of association between these co-existing factors, and also laws of social change. Again, the test of any generalisations which are made is prediction.

Viewing society as a whole, in this way, however, it is very evident that value judgments relating to moral ideals are interwoven thoroughly throughout this complex web of human relationships. It is clear that, besides the social and material factors already mentioned, the moral ideals underlying the value judgments expressed by the men and women of any society exert a very powerful force in shaping the pattern of social change. Evidently, men exercise their powers of reason not only upon material factors as such, but also *in the light of* moral ideals—no matter how vaguely held. Their struggle with social and material factors is directed, in part, by moral values, so that efforts are made to shape the outcome of social change so that it approximates as closely as possible to those ideals which are held.

Obviously, then, no study of society as a whole can be either complete or reliable unless it includes a knowledge of what these moral ideals *are* which are at work, and unless it knows how to take them into account in any generalisation which it makes.

Secondly, we might consider a partial or specialist social science: Economics. The economist seeks to build up a reliable body of knowledge concerning the economic activity of men: the production, distribution, and exchange of goods and services; the determination of prices; the role of money in the economy; fluctuations in the level of activity; and so on. He classifies these phenomena, seeks the laws of association which hold between them, and establishes certain methods of analysis which enable him to explain any economic situation. He rests his analysis of this complex activity on a very simple hypothesis of human motivation in economic behaviour. Men, it is assumed, always act in order to 'achieve maximum satisfaction' in outlay and to 'maximise their returns' in enterprise. This seems quite legitimate, and is particularly useful for deductive purposes. Nevertheless, it is clear that extensive changes in economic activity are brought about by quite different motivations. Workers may form a trade union on a cooperative basis not only to effect

changes in wages but also as a result of their *fear* of unemployment. A group or class of people who consider themselves unjustly treated may form a political party, achieve political power, and change the entire system of economic activity. A public enterprise may conduct a policy of production and sales not in order to maximise returns, but to achieve an optimal production where the price of its product is low and its revenue merely covers its costs (including repairs, replacements, additions to capital, etc.). All this is economic activity, but it is infused throughout by motivations of social justice and moral rights, and our latter example shows the presence of a 'welfare' criterion in some productive concerns. The economist will say that such factors are outside the scope of his science; but if so, it is difficult to see how he can hope to achieve a full body of knowledge relating to economic activity. At least we can say that his basic assumptions of human motivation in economic affairs are far too narrow and are inadequate. Whether we like it or not, economic activity is rarely divorced from questions of morals and justice, and if the economist ignores these factors, his generalisations may be rendered incorrect.

Fact and value are, indeed, very difficult to separate. It might be claimed, for instance, that the price of a pound of butter is an economic fact. Certainly. But if we do not limit our inquiry artificially, we must also see that this pound of butter and this price are embodiments of *relations* between the people of the community and the outcome of *human decisions*. It was one of the most valuable contributions of Marx to reveal this 'commodity-fetishism,' as he called it. Economic facts are manifestations of social relations which are certainly never removed from questions of justice; and consequently moral and political behaviour are very relevant to economic facts, and may change them considerably.

Another approach to the relation between Economics and Ethics is sometimes framed in terms of ends and means. Ethics, it is said, provides the ends of activity and Economics provides the means of attaining them. This sounds quite a clear-cut distinction, but it is not, in fact, so simple as it seems. Clearly, Ethics is concerned with means as well as ends, since the relation between means

and ends is not a disjointed one, but is integrated throughout. But it also seems true that the economist must consider ends besides means, since it is difficult to see how the efficiency of means can be at all considered without reference to the ends they serve. The truth is, I think, that the ends which are continually referred to in economic analysis are hidden in the economist's basic assumptions of human motivation. If men seek to 'achieve maximum satisfaction' in outlay and to 'maximise their returns' in enterprise, the ends of economic activity are, clearly: the highest possible consumers' satisfaction and the highest profitability for entrepreneurs. The web of economic analysis treats economic activity in relation to these ends: they are implicit in the basic assumptions of the science. So that the allocation of ends to Ethics and means to Economics is not such a clear and satisfactory distinction as it appears at first sight.

Our point here, however, is not to offer a criticism of Economics, but merely to show how the existence of moral motives in the social life of men and women serves to make the problems of this particular social science more difficult. This, I think, has been sufficiently shown. And we could go on to discuss the same complicating effect of morals in other social sciences—such as Law, Political Science, Anthropology.

At every step it is clear that no study of human society can be adequate or complete unless, in some way, the knowledge of moral ideals can be brought together with the knowledge which the Social Sciences provide.

How can this union or synthesis of knowledge be achieved?

It seems clear that these two branches of inquiry require separate disciplines. Social Science can provide a classification of data of various kinds and can arrive at generalisations concerning them which are quite beyond the scope of the philosopher. But Social Science can tell us very little about moral ideals, since they are not empirical facts, and statements about them cannot be verified by an appeal to empirical tests. Social Science can tell us that such and such value judgments are made in society, but what is *implicit* in these value judgments, what the presuppositions of these judgments are, are for the moral philosopher to discover. Scientific method is of no use

here. The clarification of ideals implicit in value judgments is essentially a task for philosophical inquiry.

The conclusion which we have arrived at, so far, seems to be that the aim of Social Science cannot be fulfilled in isolation from Ethics and Social Philosophy. Both Social Science and Ethics have their distinct fields of inquiry and have their distinct contributions to make. They are both necessary in a full study of human society, and there seems to be no reason why the results of both inquiries should not be brought together satisfactorily. Social Science and Ethics are, therefore, complementary studies. There seems to be no reason for confusion between them, and certainly no grounds for antagonism between the scientific and the philosophical approach.

This conclusion seems too simple to be accepted on its face value, however, and if we turn back to our earlier question—as to why the Social Sciences have divorced themselves so completely from Ethics—we encounter further difficulties. Let us consider, then, the questions :

Why have the Social Sciences divorced themselves from Ethics ?
—Can the Social Sciences eliminate Morals from their subject-matter ?

The Social Sciences keep their distance from Ethics for a very plausible reason : namely, to eliminate from their field of inquiry any possibility of subjective bias. This is an admirable reason, and one of which we must approve. The Social Sciences are 'positive' not 'normative' sciences ; they study not *what ought to be* but *what actually is*. They must study the facts, and not allow ethical concepts to influence or distort their factual study.

But real difficulties seem to be involved when we ask how far this scientific principle can go. What *are* these social facts ? Briefly, we might touch upon this problem in Political Science and in Social Psychology.

Political Science provides us with a factual analysis of various systems of government and a factual study of methods of governmental administration. But we do not go far in a study of politics before realising that the questions facing governments and administrators are rarely questions of truth or falsity, but are mainly questions of *degree*. Political questions are rarely 'all or nothing' questions. It is never ; Are we to be free or unfree, are

we to have a democracy or a dictatorship ; but : How far should the popular, or democratic, element in the state be limited or extended ; or how far should the power of the expert, or oligarchic, element be limited or extended ? It is almost always : How much of this ? How much of that ? Where is the line to be drawn ? Such difficult quantitative questions are invariably concerned with some means-end relationship in which moral considerations have a great part to play.

Political Science, as Economics, may claim to show the *means* of attaining the *ends* which Ethics shows to be desirable. But here, again, we see that the synthesis between Social Science and Ethics which we previously suggested is by no means a simple matter. Both Ethics and Social Science seem to be necessarily involved at every turn of the means-end relationship. Ethics cannot simply state the ideal ends of activity and then withdraw, leaving the economist and the political scientist to lay down the means. The means suggested by, say, the economist on his scientific basis (which has been quite divorced from ethical considerations) may be such as to bring about an end totally unexpected and undesirable.

We might ask the same question of the psychologist and the social psychologist. If the psychologist ignores in his analysis moral ideals which, in varying degrees of clarity, are held by human beings, might he not be eliminating some of the basic factors in human personality, some of the basic reasons for conflict in the personality ? For instance, can the formation of character and the relation between this and the formation and change of social movements and institutions be fully understood without reference to moral ideals ? 'Values' and 'norms' are terms used a good deal in American Social Psychology, but these refer to common attitudes and perceptions arising from group membership and are quite distinct from moral precepts. But might there not be a deeper and more correct analysis of personality and conflict in personality if moral ideals were clearly known and considered, especially in relation to the circumstances in which the individual was placed ? For instance—a man's moral attitude to the needs of others may involve tolerance and good will to all men and may entail the conviction that national divisions are now maladaptive and a hindrance to human welfare, yet his Government

may command him to bomb the civilians of another nation and a great deal of social pressure may be brought to bear upon him in support of this latter command. Here is a situation of conflict in the personality which, as perhaps some of us have seen, was responsible for a good deal of neurosis during the war. Clearly, there may be many conflicts of this kind in the day-to-day life of society, where moral ideals are incompatible with social circumstances and with prevailing social attitudes—and these conflicts can only be understood with reference to moral ideals. It is, indeed, rather strange that we should have come to think of conflict, by and large, in terms of 'abnormality' when there is surely so much evidence in our society of conflict resulting from contradictions and confusions arising from such normal procedures as the teaching of Science and Religion and in the demands of Government. The restlessness, dissatisfaction, and bewilderment which accompany confusion and indecision in moral conduct bulk large when compared with, say, the number of psychotic cases in the community. And who is to say whether the 'abnormalities' are not, to a great extent, a result of this 'normal' confusion?

The outcome of such considerations seems to be that moral values must be included in the data of the Social Sciences. This is not to say that the social scientist must concern himself with the *implications* of value judgments: we have decided that this is the task of the moral philosopher. But the social scientist must include those value judgments which he observes, and any clarification of them which the philosopher can provide, in his subject matter. And this point, I think, deserves stressing, as it is one on which it is easy to become confused.

The fact that a science is 'positive' does *not* mean that it must refuse to consider moral values as part of its data. A 'normative' study indicates what *ought to be*; a 'positive' science is concerned with what *actually is*. But we have seen that moral values are, in fact, part of what actually exists in social life, and a positive science whose data does not include these values must be incomplete. In some way, the moral ideals which people hold are a part of their actual nature, affecting the whole pattern of their behaviour, and the course of human life cannot be fully understood without reference to them. In the praise-

worthy attempt to rid themselves of subjective ethical distortion, the Social Sciences seem to have gone to the opposite extreme of refusing to consider moral elements in social life, which are essentially a part of their data.

Conclusions.

We are now in a position to present a clear summary of conclusions.

(1) Ethics and Social Science are distinct but complementary disciplines, and a synthesis of both is necessary in a complete study of society.

(2) Ethics must on the one hand clarify the moral ideals implicit in human value judgments. In so doing it will reveal those ideals in the light of which a detailed teleological effort is always being exerted in complicated social activity—which is always at work in the context of social and material factors, striving to shape the outcome of social change. It will thus throw a great deal of light on the formation and change of human institutions.

(3) The Social Sciences must provide a systematic classification of social data, including moral values, and seek the laws of association which hold between them.

(4) In the study of any means-end relationship, Ethics and Social Science must be closely involved throughout. For purposes of clarity, we might suggest the following outline of their relationship: (a) Ethics clarifies the desirable end. (b) Social Science provides the technical information that certain actions will attain this end. (c) Ethics again considers whether these proposed actions are themselves compatible with the end; whether they will in fact attain it. (d) The rule of action decided upon must again be discussed (by both philosopher and scientist) with those who practise the appropriate art (the judge, the manager, the civil servant, the worker) so that the value of practical experience and insight will be taken into account and the practical limits of action, in the present situation, will not be lost sight of.

(5) To the questions which arise in the student's mind, we can answer: there appears to be no necessity for estrangement or enmity between the separate Social Sciences. Mannheim suggests that the specialist sciences have developed 'defence mechanisms' which make integration difficult. 'As long,' he says, 'as the separate

social sciences are unable to translate their individual conclusions into sociological terms, they are ignoring one of the most important aspects of their subject.' Similarly, we have seen that there is no real ground for dispute between the social scientist and the moral philosopher. Ideally, it would seem that any specialist Social Science should be studied in conjunction with Ethics and Social Philosophy and, conversely, that Ethics and Social Philosophy should always be related to concrete individual and social problems. Confusion with regard to the distinct field of each inquiry might then be eliminated and the complementary nature of the two disciplines might be clearly seen and accepted.

(6) It is not possible, here, to do justice to the way in which a reconsideration of the place of Ethics among the Social Sciences might be helpful in forwarding the theoretical integration which we have seen to be so important at the present time. We have seen, however, how a consideration of moral ideals may add greatly to the soundness of Psychology and Social Psychology, both of which are basic to Social Science. No science of human experience and behaviour can ignore the existence and influence in personality and in social affairs of moral values, and it may well be that a reconsideration of the place of morals in human experience will give us a more integrated theory than yet exists.

(7) Finally, we saw that most of our reasons for wanting a reliable Social Science were moral reasons. Clearly, then, one of our most important inquiries should be that of clarifying the moral ideals which all these reasons presuppose. Scientific knowledge, no matter how successful we are in achieving it, will be of little or no use if the ideals in the light of which we are going to apply it remain confused, inconsistent, and only vaguely known.

RONALD FLETCHER.

Art. 8.—THE TIED COTTAGE.

I.

ON more than one English hillside, a local man will show you certain lines, thrown up either by the peculiar slant of of the light or by a slightly different colour in the crops. These lines become visible at certain times during sunrise or sunset, or when the corn is just 'chimpling' after sowing and when crops are just beginning to ripen. They may run in squares, in strips, or circles. They are the lines, seemingly permanent, of ancient workings of the soil. In the case of circles, they represent the site of tombs, or other great buildings connected with the spiritual life of the early agriculturalist, but in the case of squares and strips, they represent holdings.

Every agricultural worker of rural stock, which still means the great majority of them, will, in talking about his life, sooner or later bring the conversation round to the past. He quite often has a very clear store of fascinating facts about the fields of his village as they were used fifty, eighty, or one hundred years ago. He knows all about the tragedies which befell his kind during the period of enclosing common lands, and he can even yet be roused to bitterness against the landowner because he knows that at one time, many, many generations ago, every rural man had his own 'strip,' and that none but he had the right of ownership over it. Those fleeting lines on the hillside are, in fact, the borders of the very strips which he once owned.

In employment, the rural man is not easy to handle. Farmers of his own type and stock know this very well indeed. For life on the land remains to-day as it has always been—a *life*: not a mere means of earning a living, but a corporate life, in which the ability to do one's work well is not enough. In addition to good work, there must be throughout the farm an ability among the workers to adjust themselves to each other, from the farmer right down to the humblest beginner. This kind of adjustment is far too human an activity on the land to be controlled or interfered with by any outside authority or organisation.

Just as the lines sometimes seen on the farmers' hill-sides are evidence of a system of cultivation with which the

worker was once much more effectively connected in a personal sense, so, if wrongly handled, the modern rural workers' resistance is evidence that he still remembers that system. Not very far below the surface of his mind lies the feeling that the employer is in reality farming his, the worker's, land. This feeling is now active only in its traditional sense; but if the employer is not willing, in addition to paying the weekly wage, to make other recognised concessions, the feeling grows from tradition to reality, and very quickly too. In such cases the rural man will hit back at the usurper by giving his employer in return for his minimum wage only the amount of help he thinks is compatible with it. In this sense those vague lines on the hillside still hold their significance.

One of the rights written by the hillside lines is this. If you take from a man his land, but wish, nevertheless, to employ his services to your own advantage, the very least you can do is to provide him with a house. In view of the loss of his independent self-expression, the least you can concede is his right, not only to a house if he works on your farm, but to a *free* house. This right most farmers, especially those of rural stock, recognise. They recognise also the right of the agricultural worker to those last vestiges of personal freedom remaining from the early days when he could build and own his own house; freedom from restrictions upon his activities in his cottage or upon his plot of land which goes with it. Once within his cottage gates, he is usually in no way intruded upon by his employer, unless of course he is actually damaging the property—and even then, most farmers are reluctant to interfere. All of which, together with the absence of rent, or at any rate of any but a nominal rent, are very potent factors when considering accommodation for the farm worker other than the tied cottage.

There is, therefore, a traceable feeling among workers on the land with regard to the one single instance of the 'tied cottage.' It is a feeling which has to be recognised, and handled with a certain discretion. It lies in the belief of the heart that the farmer has no true 'right' to the land he is farming, let alone to appoint living apartments to those who were once owners. But this grievance is now active only in its traditional sense; it has no deeper impression upon the mind of the rural worker, unless

roused by unjust handling, than the vague outlines of the strip holdings have upon the hillsides.

II.

This feeling has, however, nothing to do with the 'tied cottage' issue as brought into prominence by modern politics. The 'tied cottage' question now appears as the talking point of those bodies whose claim it is that they represent the corporate voice of the farm workers. But, as everyone really acquainted with the rural man knows, any real grievances he may have are always intimately connected with his immediate surroundings and his immediate world: that is to say, his farm; and they are grievances which, like family differences, can be quickly cleared up if the goodwill exists to do so.

First, let us see exactly what a 'tied cottage' is. There is no legal definition of a 'tied cottage,' but the phrase is generally descriptive of a dwelling occupied by a worker 'by virtue of' his employment. That is to say, he is entitled to live in the dwelling only while in the service of its owner. No matter what the reason, once the employment ceases, the worker's right to live in the house ceases with it.

Organised rural labour points out the abuses attendant upon this position. It quotes four types of occupiers of rural and privately owned cottages, 'tied' cottages, and claims that none of them have reasonable *security* of tenure. The four types of occupiers are:

1. 'Servant occupiers' whose claim to live in their houses rests solely upon the fact of their employment with the farmer. They do not pay rent and can be evicted from their houses without legal sanction of any kind, provided that no undue violence is employed in the process.

2. Tenants who work for their landlords and who were given tenancy of the cottage because they were working for the farmer. These can be ejected by order from the court. The process is to serve Statutory Notice to Quit, preferably through a solicitor; and this notice must give at least seven clear days to quit, and be read over to the tenant, or adult person on the premises, and be understood by him. If the tenant does not comply with this notice, the farmer may appeal to the court. To strengthen his

case, he may obtain a certificate from the cottage panel of the local Agricultural Committee, consisting of one farmer, one workers' representative, and an independent chairman, to show that possession of the cottage is necessary for the proper cultivation of his land, although the obtaining of this certificate is not necessary; nor is the notion true that the farmer must provide or prove the existence of alternative accommodation. All he has to do is to prove that he has engaged another man who is waiting for the cottage. Having done this, whatever the cause of disagreement between the farmer and his man, the court is powerless to do other than order the tenant out within a period of not more than thirty days.

3. Tenants of a farm cottage who do not work for their landlords. A certificate from the local Agricultural Executive Committee is here necessary to show that the cottage is required for the proper cultivation of the land, and it must also be proved that the farmer has engaged a man who is waiting for the cottage. If the farmer fulfils these conditions, he obtains possession with little difficulty.

4. Occupiers of cottages not owned by the farmer. The cottage can be bought over the head of the tenant, and a certificate from the Agricultural Committee enables the farmer to eject the occupants without providing or proving the existence of alternative accommodation.

Points 3 and 4 might well be considered to hold more possibility of injustice to tenants than the other two. Points 1 and 2 are surely the main concern of the agricultural workers, and as far as they are concerned, upon these two points the main edifice of the case against the tied cottage system surely rests. As can be seen in these two points, the essence of the argument against the system is contained in the fact that agricultural workers have no guarantee of *security* of tenancy, and this leaves them open to many abuses at the hands of the unscrupulous employer.

There is little doubt that the case against the tied cottage system as elaborated from these points by organised labour is in the main based upon facts. But it is also clear that, however just a case may be, it is not necessarily in the interests of the community concerned to press it unless we are quite sure we have the backing of the majority of that community. Such is the nature of life on the land that, except in the most general matters, it must surely be

difficult to show that rural men as a whole fall in line with *any* form of official view ; or can be organised sufficiently to enable a body wishing to represent them to be confident that their corporate opinion can be fairly expressed. It is possible that a very great number of rural men connected with such organisations might never have questioned the abuses inherent in the tied cottage system *to the extent of making them a political issue* had they not been enlightened concerning these abuses by the organisations themselves. Further, as anyone knows who has worked with them, the number of men who prefer to attach themselves with regard to their opinions to their own immediate masters is very great indeed ; and these must therefore be considered in the main dissociated from any view put forward by organised labour.

It has been my experience that the agricultural worker is not generally interested in what appears to him as the more abstract developments of modern society. His outlook, by the very nature of his life, seems to me to be a good deal more intimate and ' earthy ' : he seeks for causes and solutions to his problems from neither London nor any other distant source.

In trying to obtain a proper perspective of the motives and feelings of the agricultural worker upon the question of the tied cottage, it might be best, therefore, to leave political and social arguments to the political and social theorists, and get down to those items which might certainly be considered by rural men to contain a good deal more reality.

III.

Had there not been a political programme recently invented against the *system* of the tied cottage, I am quite sure that the agricultural worker would not to this day have seriously questioned its necessity. If you ask him what object the tied cottage system serves, he will give you the two obvious replies—to house the farm workers, and to ensure that the farm has workers nearby in case of emergency. As can be imagined, with large farm animals emergencies of all kinds arise constantly throughout the year, which the staff on duty at the time cannot always handle by themselves.

If you ask the farm worker further if such houses should

be owned by the farmer, a few moments' reflection will face you with the inevitable poser, 'If the farmer doesn't own them, who should?' They all know that, under present conditions, neither a private landlord nor a local council can provide a house at anything like a rent the agricultural man is willing to pay, and the farmer is the only man who can and does provide him with a house within his means.

Another point is the obvious and valuable advantage of being situated close to one's work; but the most notable advantage for the agricultural worker is the freedom he enjoys within his own precincts, as compared with the host of presumptuous restrictions with which other citizens in privately owned and, in outstanding particular, in houses rented from local councils, are forced to comply.

Further, the agricultural worker, while quite amenable to living in a small group with his own kind, might not take very readily to living next door to other workers in other kinds of occupations. It cannot be stressed too often that the land, unlike most other occupations, is not only a means of earning a living, it is also very definitely a life to be lived. There is not, even to-day, complete understanding of this feature of land work among people not connected with it: a fact shown by the stigma which even yet land work carries, and of which land workers are still conscious when mixing with those in other walks of life.

Finally, from the worker's view, one can foresee that should the campaign for the freeing of farm cottages be successful now or in the observable future, apart from the grave financial difficulties which the farm worker might have to face in such a change, he would without a doubt find himself at last forced into the ramifications of modern social administration—a feature of modern life which he detests with all his heart, in spite of the well-meant objectives for which it strives.

The agricultural worker is not incapable, either, of seeing something of the tied cottage question from his master's point of view. He knows that most farmers are dependent upon labour from the farm cottages, and he knows, too, that if men who for various reasons can no longer supply the farmer with their labour stay on in the cottages, the farm will come to a standstill.

And, times being as they are, and likely to be in the

foreseeable future, can there be any guarantee that no one will take a farm house, merely for the sake of obtaining a house, and then having settled himself, seek employment elsewhere? Opponents of the tied cottage system might here point out that a method of partly meeting this difficulty is already in operation; the local council lets its agricultural houses on condition the tenant stays in agriculture. This, they maintain, is a good thing, for it removes the 'hold' the farmer might have on the tenant, and, placing him in competition with other local farmers, tends to make him a more agreeable employer. You may point this out to the rural man, but do not forget that he keeps his eye on the land and what comes out of it. Often he is a much harder judge of his fellow's husbandry than the farmer himself. If the farmer's say in who is to take the farm cottage is to be limited or if he is unable to free himself of a man who proves of no use to the land, the farm will certainly suffer. All true agricultural men are concerned to see the land properly used; they have no brief for those who do not work well. They would want to be sure that only first-class men like themselves would be allowed to take farm cottages. Who would be the best judge of this: the local council or some other housing authority, or the farmer?

Another point laboured by opponents of the system, is the hardship involved in the old farm worker, who has lived in his cottage for many years and brought up his family in it, having to turn out when he is past work. But whether the cottages were tied or not, those who know the ways of rural men know that there would be little change on this issue in the present practice. At present, the older man does not regard it as a 'hardship' to have to vacate his cottage when he can no longer work; he accepts that as inevitable. He knows perfectly well that someone must take his place, and therefore his cottage. It is rare indeed for him to have no children; judging by modern standards, he still has quite a large family, and in retirement he expects to live with one of his children. In the countryside, there is not quite the same feeling towards one's in-laws as there appears to be in more urban areas. A retired countryman or countrywoman is regarded usually as a welcomed asset in a rural household, particularly so because rural folk have still a kind of understood law as to

their position in the family, a law which older folk do not generally seek to violate. In any case, most farmers are very sympathetic towards old and valued workers, and if they are unable to allow them to continue in their cottages until death, by no means an unheard-of concession, they try not to worry them more than necessary when they approach the end of their time. I have yet to meet the old agricultural worker who will not have this particular problem arranged some years before his actual retirement. No one can say that living with one's children is an ideal arrangement, but it is one which occurs in many households, tied or not. And who can tell whether the handling of such a situation by a council or some other authority would be as human and as patient as that shown by any decent farmer, when dealing with an old worker to whom by this time he usually feels more than a little attached?

Would it be possible to fix a period of time in one cottage, say twenty years' continuing tenancy, after which the tenant would have the right to remain until death? It might prove extremely impracticable indeed. Men might not only have to stick to a bad farmer for the sake of earning such a right, but a bad farmer might well seek means to turn them out just before the end of their term in order not to saddle himself with a 'blind' cottage. Those who were not so unscrupulous would gradually find their accommodation for workers dried up.

There is much to show, therefore, that the agricultural man does not in his heart see so much evil in the system of the tied cottage as some propagandists would have us believe. Without any doubt whatsoever, there *are* evils in the system, and very grave ones; but the rural man does not place implicit faith in these entirely fresh starts. Evils there may be in the old system, and evils he knows there will be in a new—perhaps *new* evils which neither he nor anyone else has had experience of handling. I have no hesitation whatever in stating that, in this or any other rural problem, the rural man prefers to work along the lines of intimate relationship between man and man, as between the 'master' and himself, despite the evils he knows to be inherent in it.

The tied cottage is to the agricultural worker much more than a house to live in, free or cheap of rent, near to his work, and a small area where he is free to develop his own

inclinations. It is also a symbol, and read as such, of the farmer's ability to do right by his fellows. The tied cottage is, in fact, a revelation of the farmer's character, and as such to-day, throughout the rural countryside, too often presents a sorry spectacle. Organised labour has revealed some shocking pictures of rural housing during the past ten years, and although a steady inroad upon the state of farm houses in the way of improvement is observable, the picture is still shocking. It is quite a false idea that bad houses exist only here and there with particularly bad farmers. They are still quite general—but there is a solution to the situation.

But I do not think the rural man sees any real solution by taking them out of the hands of the farmers. Local councils, despite the utmost efforts within their financial means, are able to make but slow headway against the continual demand for new houses, for the very same reasons as the farmer's—shortage of building materials, lack of money, terrifically high costs and shortage of building labour. To add to their burden thousands of dilapidated farm houses can surely solve nothing; and even if it could, local councils cannot carry out the extensive and expensive repairs needed to farm cottages without obtaining the money from somewhere. It is obvious that even if they could take over the problem of the tied cottage, they would have to charge rents somewhere near the present rents of their own council houses, and it is to avoid these rents that the agricultural man *prefers* a house owned by the farmer, even when agricultural houses built by the council are available.

There is a solution—once more a simple, obvious one—which appeals to the agricultural man much more than using these intimate grievances for the purpose of political action which he cannot see will in the end make him any better off. On most farms, especially if they have been long established, there is an abundance of old building material: timber, bricks and the like; usually a few bags of cement not in use, sand, and gravel. A very great deal can be done in the way of making farm cottages comfortable and habitable with waste materials to be found on the farms, and with little expenditure on the part of the farmer, if the man is allowed access to such materials and is willing to do the work himself. But this depends

altogether upon another aspect of the tied cottage; a point which is in no small measure responsible for farm houses falling into ruin and decay far more than they need ever have done.

The tied cottage is not only the symbol of the farmer's ability to do the right thing by his men; it is also a thoroughly reliable pointer to the state of security on the farm. If the house is dilapidated, the garden only haphazardly cultivated, there is in all probability another reason for its condition apart from the meanness of the farmer and apart from the slovenliness of its occupant. If an agricultural man feels secure, he is the last person to leave his garden not properly cultivated. But, as the older farm hand will often say, 'Never do too much to a tied cottage; you don't know what might happen Michaelmas.'

This is very true. As pointed out before, to be good at one's work is not quite enough; but as regards adjustments a considerable number of farmers expect them to be made by the farm worker, and are not always prepared to make adjustments themselves. In such cases, a very small pretext will cause a man to whom the farmer does not take a liking to be given his notice at Michaelmas, and it is by no means an uncommon practice for farmers to sack men at Michaelmas and take on fresh hands again during the busy seasons.

Is the solution to this state of a certain insecurity on the land to remove the control of farm houses from the farmer? It does not seem entirely just to free tied cottages on this count, fundamental and important as it may appear. More than one aged labourer lives in retirement in a tied cottage because he has worked for the owner of the house, and for his father before him. There is a good, solid core of farmers who are not willing to take a man on too lightly, nor willing to sack him too easily. Prevalent as the other type may be, they are still in the minority; and in addition to this, they are very well known. An agricultural man does not go to such farmers except as a last resort, and if he has to take a job as a last resort, the chances are that he is not one of the best of workers anyway.

It may be that something might be agreed in the way of removing from a farmer who persistently and lightly sacks his men, the power to eject them; but to condemn the

whole community of farmers on the grounds that they are liable to abuse their powers of ejection, when in fact most of them never do, is quite unjust. Even among farms which are insecure to work upon, very few employers carry out their powers to their ultimate logical conclusion—putting a man who has not complied with the order out upon the road. Indeed, it is not unusual for a farmer who has fallen apart from one of his men, to wait months for that man to become suited before he engages another in his place.

IV.

On the whole, therefore, if we make a fair and dispassionate examination of the question of the tied cottage, farmers and owners emerge, not as the selfish and unfeeling exploiters of labour which some propagandists would have us believe, but as human beings, varying in their treatment of others, no more, but not less, thoughtful than other folk; no more, but not less, aware of their responsibilities to their men. Nevertheless, it seems clear that organised representation of both farmers and men agrees in the belief that farm cottages should be improved, and on this point I think organised representation does reflect well the corporate opinions of landmen of all classes.

In this, surely, lies the kernel of the situation. If all sides are in fair agreement that farming cottages should be brought up to normal living standards, is there no way in which they can work together to find some means of overcoming difficulties in the way of their improvement? Can these organisations not jointly bring their considerable influence to bear, particularly with regard to the obtaining of permits and licences, in organising labour, in making a survey of second-hand materials available, and organising the means of conveying such material to the spots most in need of them? Can it be true that after all the proud experience landmen have of sound and skilful improvisation, they have reached a stage where their common interests have been artificially divided by semi-political nonsense, and thus rendered them impotent?

I believe that organised representation of employers and employed on the land would be doing a noteworthy service to their members and to their country in these troubled

times by making a joint effort to bring the workers' cottages, perhaps not completely up to modern standards, but to a very great improvement on their present condition; instead of dividing themselves against each other as they appear to do at present, warring indefinitely over a political theory so obviously questionable if it could be put into practice, while we workers go on living and waiting impotently in our countryside hovels.

But, as we have already seen, any such practical scheme is bound up with the necessity of introducing a much stronger element of security for many farm workers. Here again I believe that much could be done by co-operation between employers' and workers' representatives with regard to encouraging farmers on the one hand to be more careful in the way they engage their men; to encourage them to engage labour with a view to long-term service, thereby not taking them on too lightly, and to firmly discountenance the thoughtless practice of taking on people to see the farm over the busy season and then discharging them on the slightest pretext. On the other hand, workers' representatives might well examine the possibility of assisting men to find positions suitable to their experience and temperament.

It seems to me that some action on these lines smacks of trying to deal directly and in a practical manner with the evils of farm life which are the main causes of dissatisfaction both among men and employers. To try to solve any problem by seeking to destroy altogether a necessary system like the tied cottage, a system until recently unquestioned by the vast majority of landmen, farmers and workers alike, seems to be ignoring the obvious practical difficulties in the belief that they will all disappear when yet another social theory not based upon known human experience is put into practice. It is possible that if this theory were put into practice, many of these difficulties *would* disappear—but let us as far as we can try to foresee and bear in mind those other difficulties which would inevitably arise in adopting an alternative system. Surely we have learned by now that modification of past experience and development is much more sure of a beneficial result than is the dangerous procedure of a complete break with it?

NORMAN L. GOODLAND.

Art. 9.—PRIVATELY OWNED WOODLANDS—YESTER-DAY, TO-DAY, AND TO-MORROW.

ANYONE who views Great Britain from the cabin of an aeroplane seems to see a well-wooded country. Such is the general impression produced by the panorama of spinneys, parkland, and hedgerow timber, interspersed with larger woods, which unfolds itself beneath. In reality, the facts are otherwise. Great Britain's 6.5 per cent. of woodland compares unfavourably with other European countries. Even Holland, which we are inclined to regard as a land of flat fields and open pastures, is slightly ahead of Great Britain with nearly 8 per cent. In the case of most other Western European countries—France, Germany, Norway and, above all, Sweden—the disparity is far greater. Even these figures understate the true weakness of Great Britain's position. As the outcome of decades of neglect, and of the abnormal fellings of two great wars, over one million acres (approximately one-third of our entire forest area) is to-day classified as scrub, devastated, or recently felled. As a means of rapidly replenishing our supplies of sawn timber in an emergency, this great area must be regarded as out of action. If any considerable national asset craves attention to-day, it is our woods.

To understand the present, let us glance backward into the past. In early mediæval times, particularly on the heavy clay, much of Great Britain was tree-covered, with the villages surrounded by their great open fields standing out like islands in a sea of green ; but it is safe to say that this woodland resembled the bush which to-day covers so much of Africa. Occasional fine trees of mature growth were no doubt to be found, but interspersed with dense thorn thickets, with stunted and decayed timber, and with all the debris of a natural forest. In the latter part of the seventeenth century came Evelyn and his followers, with an approach to the growing of trees in which science, utility, and amenity all had a place. For national and local reasons, the forestry which subsequently emerged during the eighteenth century differed somewhat from that which was developing simultaneously on the Continent. The maritime expansion of Great Britain produced a demand for ships' timbers which were curved rather than straight :

hence the coppice and standard growth even to-day so characteristic of the south of England. Simultaneously, the love of great landowners for symmetry and layout was covering England with ornamental timber. In the days of Queen Anne this commonly took the form of avenues ; at a somewhat later date, avenues gave place to the planned landscape of 'Capability Brown' with its emphasis on clumps and spinneys.

Let us pass on rapidly to the sixties and seventies of last century—reputedly the golden age of high farming and of the great estate. On a limited number of large properties—at Woburn in Bedfordshire, at Boughton in Northamptonshire, at Brocklesby in Lincolnshire, and on their counterparts in Scotland—forestry was extensively practised and a sound tradition of forest management existed ; but, in the main, woodland yielded pride of place to farmland and the British estate owner, when he was a tree-lover, was as much concerned with amenity, with arboriculture, and even with sport as with the commercial aim of growing the maximum quantity of straight timber per acre.

Since that date, four major political and economic events have left their mark on British forestry. First, the final triumph of the metal ship, and with it a cessation of the demand for the type of timber which the old English woodlands had been specially planned to produce. Secondly, the prolonged agricultural depression of the 1880's caused—or at any rate aggravated—by the doctrine of unrestricted imports which then held sway. Lacking capital and a market for his timber, it was small wonder that the owner neglected his woods or concentrated on the preservation of game, which, even from the purely commercial angle, appeared more worth while than the growing of trees. Next came the First World War of 1914–18, and with it the submarine menace. In a flash, the weakness of an economy which relied exclusively on overseas imports was revealed. At the end of the war, somewhat ambitious plans were made for the re-establishment of felled woodlands and for State planting. To a considerable extent these plans were jettisoned in the economic blizzard of 1920–30. Something, however, was saved from the wreckage. The Forestry Commission, established in 1919, commenced operations on a restricted

scale, but with gradually increasing prestige and efficiency. By 1939 it had created a State forest which had reached the respectable size of 369,000 acres.*

Such was the position when the outbreak of the Second World War imposed a second supreme test on our woodlands. It was obvious from the start that the burden must fall very largely on the private woodland owner. The State forest was still too young to contribute more than a trickle of production. In the five war years 1939-44, home fellings of saleable timber shot up from 4 to 60 per cent. of the national requirements †—a notable performance, but one which involved another formidable overdraft on resources which were already woefully insufficient.

Faced by this prospect, Mr Churchill's wartime administration cannot be charged with lack of foresight. Early in 1943, a Report on Post-War Forestry was published by the Commission, in which the situation was exhaustively reviewed and a long-term policy laid down, envisaging the establishment in the next half-century of not less than five million acres of well-managed woodland. The essential point to grasp in considering this figure is that it pre-supposes a combined effort by the State and the private owner. By a planting programme which some regard as over-ambitious, it is hoped ultimately to increase the State forest to something approaching three million acres, but the remaining two million acres or more of the official target can come only from private sources. Over and above this, it is calculated that there is in Great Britain, entirely in private hands, nearly 200,000 acres of small woods of under five acres, not officially reckoned as forest area, but capable, if properly managed, of making an important contribution to timber resources. Bearing all this in mind, it is probably true to say that, however successful the development of publicly owned woodland may be, approximately half of our total timber resources must continue to remain in private hands. In the meantime, having regard to the immaturity of the State woods, the great bulk of the sizeable timber of the country is still privately owned. If a Third World War should break out to-morrow, it is to the

* See Report of Forestry Commission for 1946, p. 18.

† See *ibid.*, p. 10.

privately owned woodlands that the country would again inevitably turn for the bulk of its supplies.*

The Report having been published, its contents were forthwith discussed by representatives of the Commission and of Forestry Societies and woodland owners. Certain conclusions were reached. The national importance of replanting the felled areas and the need for their subsequent after-care were agreed. Acquisition by the State was envisaged in cases where the private owner was unable or unwilling to manage effectively ; and a general support was given to a scheme of Dedication, under which, in return for certain forms of State assistance, the owner reserved his woodland areas for the growing of trees. But in the years that followed 1943, the seed thus sown was slow in ripening. Four years later, singularly little progress had been made, at any rate as far as the private side of the industry was concerned. Only the fringe of the replanting problem had been touched. Open hostility to official policy was the exception, but there was widespread misconception as to its objects, and hesitation in accepting the permanent obligations which it involved.

And here it may be opportune to say a word about the pros and cons of Dedication, which from now on formed the *pièce de résistance* of government policy. Let us admit that the word is not too happily chosen. To the uninitiated it suggests a gift to the public, to a municipality, or to the Church, or even a call to the devout life : in short, anything except what it actually is—viz. an undertaking by the owner, *while retaining full ownership*, that certain land will be reserved in perpetuity by him and his successors in title for the growing of timber in accordance with the recognised rules of good forestry. Quite a lot of time has been spent explaining this to the outside public, and even to the woodland owner himself. Once its meaning is grasped, it will be manifest that Dedication embodies many useful features. Perhaps the most important of these is that it imposes an element of discipline on owner and State alike. Forestry is a venture covering many periods of management and more than one life ; for success it demands continuity. This cannot be achieved unless a long-term

* According to official figures, the volume of timber in privately owned woodlands is 2,280 million cubic feet and in State forests 376 million cubic feet. (Census of 1947-49. Table 9.)

plan of operations is made and adhered to. What makes this all the more necessary is that, when there occurs on an agricultural estate one of the periodic upheavals caused by the death of the owner, it is the family lawyer who is apt to take control. Such imperative needs as the payment of legateses and the satisfaction of taxes take precedence over the agricultural and woodland needs of the estate.

To the owner who fears that Dedication may become too rigid or too onerous, the answer is really quite simple: the plan of operations on which all else depends is drawn up by himself. It is for him to provide in it for such latitude as he may reasonably require. Nor (apart from the specific assurances which have been given) is there any reason to anticipate an undue propensity for fault-finding on the part of the officials of the Commission. They are to-day a somewhat overworked body of men, trying to administer a number of complicated Acts of Parliament and at the same time to build up a great State forest. If a private owner is doing his job, having given him what help they can, they are only too glad to leave him in peace. They have no special desire to assume the control of scattered estate woodlands in preference to broad, homogeneous areas well suited to large-scale management.

Dedication controls the State in a more subtle manner. Governed as we are by an urban democracy, there are two fears always present in the mind of the rural producer—that, in time of peace, he will be sacrificed to the competition of unregulated imports; that, in time of crisis, on grounds of national expediency, he will be denied the right to reap the harvest which then only scarcity conditions put within his grasp. It is because it offers a solution to this difficulty that farmers have accepted the Agriculture Act with a good grace. Under its terms, in return for a guarantee of reasonably efficient production, the producer receives the security of a stable and reasonably remunerative price. For many excellent reasons, to reproduce the Agriculture Act in forestry would be impossible. Nevertheless, up to a point Dedication may be said to serve a somewhat similar purpose. Over and above the cash benefits which it promises, there is an implied bargain between the State and the woodland owner: having encouraged the private citizen to undertake the considerable financial outlay which good woodland management

involves, the State can hardly permit his economic collapse. A recognition of this fact lay behind the statement of policy made by Mr Tom Williams, on behalf of the late Government, in the House of Commons on July 28, 1949 :

‘ It is manifestly impossible to deal with a long-term venture such as forestry in the same way as agriculture, and it is not feasible to guarantee prices for . . . timber which may be felled over the next 50 to 100 years. The Government, however, recognises that a healthy and stable forest industry is an essential part of the national economy and proposes to review the economics of British forestry at convenient intervals in consultation with woodland owners and the timber trade.’

It is safe to predict that the more widespread and successful Dedication becomes, the harder will it be for the State to divest itself of responsibility for forestry's economic future.

If the causes which impeded forestry at the moment immediately following the war are analysed, they are found to be the following :

First, the hopelessly unsatisfactory price position. Since 1939, prices of homegrown timber had been held by controls at a level only slightly above pre-war, and far below world prices. Wages and all other out-goings had doubled or more than doubled. Foresters were subject to a system which can fairly be described as getting the worst out of both worlds. For the unfair position thus created, two possible remedies existed : either, while retaining price control, as in agriculture, to relate it to the high and ever-rising level of wages and costs ; or else, by the removal of price control, to give the British producer the chance to work out his own salvation. Neither of these remedies did the ‘ powers that be ’ seem anxious to adopt.

Another major source of complaint was the multiplicity of departments and officials dealing with homegrown timber, and in particular the wartime provision under which so many decisions vitally affecting it rested with the Board of Trade. It seemed obvious to woodland owners that their difficulties would be more sympathetically regarded by the Ministry of Agriculture than by a department whose primary duty was to obtain large quantities of timber at low prices for the needs of the industrial population. Finally, there were shortcomings in the terms of the

Covenant itself. The first and perhaps the most important was, once again, the price factor. The principal inducements which the Government offered to the Dedicating owner were grants for planting and maintenance. Though the exact cost of replanting had never been determined, or the proportion of the grant to total costs, it was obvious, in a time of ever-rising prices, that the true value of an unadjusted grant was constantly falling. By 1945 and still more by 1948, the inexorable march of inflation had already made inappropriate the scale of grant envisaged in 1943. It became a matter of vital importance, (1) to get the grants to a level in line with post-war costs, and (2) to provide for their revision at reasonably frequent intervals, should the rise of wages and prices continue. Secondly, while Continuity is the *raison d'être* of Dedication, Continuity may defeat its own object if it imposes on an owner or his successors obligations which they are clearly unable to shoulder. In some instances (not very numerous), if the Commission itself is unwilling to purchase, to lease, or to manage, and if no alternative arrangements can be made, after due examination, the remedy of a release from Dedication should be provided. Thirdly, in sylvicultural matters it was felt that the dedicator who considered himself aggrieved should have the right of appeal to an impartial tribunal. It may be said, in passing, that the justification for this grows daily more apparent. As in farming, so in forestry, we are entering a period when new techniques, rotations, and experiments are opening up new possibilities. On economic grounds, much that is novel is becoming accepted practice; much that is traditional is being discarded. At such a moment, it is obviously desirable that individual ingenuity should not be frustrated by too rigid an adherence to the classical forestry of the past.

Such was the position at the commencement of 1948. Private owners must be pardoned if they ascribe the remarkable change which has since occurred in their fortunes to the foundation, in the autumn of that year, of the United Kingdom Forestry Committee, on which, for the first time, owners from England, Scotland, and Wales sat side by side with the representatives of the national Forestry Societies. To say this casts no slur on the Commission. Unity always spells strength; division weak-

ness. The busy officials of the Commission could hardly be blamed if they paid small attention to the views of an interest whose voices up till then had been numerous and sometimes conflicting. The first act of the new committee was to produce a reasoned statement of its aims,* in which an attempt was made to define the shortcomings of the existing position and to suggest remedies. Since that date, its arguments have been driven home by continuous discussion and negotiation with the Commission and with the Government Departments principally concerned.

Let us name a few of the achievements for which, in part at any rate, it can claim the credit. The Dedication Grant has been progressively increased from 7*l.* 10*s.* to 14*l.*, the Maintenance Grant from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 4*s.* 6*d.* per acre. More recently, two further grants have been added—a Thinning Grant, to encourage the proper management of young plantations, and a Poplar Grant. While none of these represents more than a fraction of the cost of establishment, the help and still more the encouragement which they give to timber producers small and large is very considerable. The somewhat complicated provisions of the Covenant with regard to disputes have been amended. In silvicultural matters it is now possible for the grower who feels himself aggrieved to submit his case to an independent investigating committee. Naturally, and rightly, an escape from Dedication has not been made too easy—but it is now possible for an owner or his successors in title to obtain release on satisfying the Commission that the carrying out of his obligations is no longer possible. In the course of 1949, in accordance with the Committee's advice, the control of felling was removed from the Board of Trade and vested in the Forestry Commission. Shortly afterwards followed the eagerly awaited announcement that price control had been abolished. The immediate result of this was a considerable rise in homegrown timber prices, as the market adjusted itself to its natural level. In March 1950, the U.K. Committee recorded its approval of these developments by publicly recommending woodland owners to dedicate. Within the next few months this advice was endorsed by Landowners' Councils in England and Scotland, and by the Councils of the national Forestry Societies.

* Entitled 'Future Policy for Privately Owned Woodlands.'

One further Parliamentary measure deserves attention—the Forestry Act of 1951. The primary object of its introduction was to control felling. For this, there was ample justification. Faced by a national emergency, any Government which permitted promiscuous felling would clearly have been failing in its duty. Over and above this, it was high time that a curb should be put on the practice by which estates were sold *en bloc*, despoiled of their timber, and then resold without any responsibility by vendor or purchaser to make good the loss which had been incurred. In no other forest-minded country in Western Europe is a similar dissipation of timber reserves permitted. But the Bill was unfortunately drafted. In an attempt to make assurance doubly sure, excessive powers were sought. Dedicated and undedicated land, the experienced and the inefficient were treated alike. How distasteful some of the Bill's provisions appeared to those principally concerned was evidenced by the widespread criticism which greeted its appearance in the Upper House. What subsequently transpired is a striking example of the value of our parliamentary institutions on the comparatively rare occasions when they are allowed to function without Party acrimony. Both sides of the House are to be congratulated on the introduction of far-reaching improvements. As a result, adequate rights of appeal and adequate compensation have been provided for the owner permanently denied the right to fell. The special position of dedicated and planned woodlands is recognised by their virtual exclusion from felling control. Over and above this, the principle of consultation between the Commission and the industry, which has developed during recent years, is confirmed by the inclusion in the Act of the Homegrown Timber Advisory Committee, the Regional Advisory Committees, the Reference Committees for the hearing of appeals, and by the statutory definition of their powers and duties. Henceforth, a return to more bureaucratic methods is impossible without special legislation. In recommending the Bill on the Report Stage to his fellow peers, the Lord Chancellor spoke as follows :

'The Bill is now becoming a House of Lords Bill and not a Party Bill at all. It is being carried through its stages by the common consent of all concerned, including a large number of people who know a great deal about the subject.'

His words were well justified. The 1951 Act in its final form partakes of the nature of a Foresters' Charter, consolidating and qualifying legislation which has preceded it, increasing control in the few directions in which this is justified, but confirming also the industry's claim to a measure of self-government and the machinery by which this is achieved.

On this hopeful note, our account of the legislative activities of the last few years may fitly close. After its slow start, the Dedication Scheme now seems fairly under way, with not far short of half a million acres of land in process of dedication. The committees created by the 1951 Act have been appointed and are commencing their duties; the relations between the private owner and the Commission are increasingly cordial. More important still, there is to be observed in the mind of the woodland owner a spirit of inquiry and a growth of knowledge and enthusiasm which augur well for the future.

It remains only to consider certain economic factors which may well, in the long run, have a more profound effect on the future than good intentions or even good laws. The first of these is wages—or perhaps it would be more accurate to say the wage/output relationship. Forestry is *par excellence* a long-term venture. It is an industry, also, in which mechanisation has only limited possibilities. In such a business it is above all necessary that a reasonably constant proportion should exist between receipts and outgoings. It is, of course, true that the actual cost of production of a tree now a century old may be low in proportion to to-day's selling price. But this is wholly irrelevant. In a well managed forest, what is felled to-day must continuously be replaced by what will come to maturity in succeeding generations. This necessitates constant expenditure on equipment, and the permanent employment of a labour force averaging one to two men to the 100 acres—approximately the same as is required in ordinary mixed farming. Recent history seems to suggest that the future trend of world timber prices will be upwards rather than downwards, but no secular movement of this kind can keep pace with the spectacular increase in wages and costs which we have recently witnessed. Demands for higher wages have to-day become almost as regular a feature of our industrial system as the annual holiday. With such

demands, the owners of private woodlands (usually people of moderate means and limited capital) cannot compete. To few of our industries are existing inflationary tendencies more fatal. This is not to say that wages should never rise, but rather that wage increases can only be justified if they keep in step with increasing output per man.

A second fundamental point concerns the control of felling. The necessity for this is generally admitted, but the very natural desire of officials to be on the safe side in the building up of timber reserves must not be allowed to produce a control so tight as to throttle private forestry and those timber merchants who largely depend upon it. Unlike the State, private owners must provide for current expenditure out of current receipts. In addition, they must find capital for fresh equipment and for the renewing of existing equipment. This is only possible in an industry with regular receipts, regular turnover, and a reasonable prospect of profit. In practice, for the next few years, permitted fellings look like being stabilised somewhere between 31 and 36 million cubic feet per annum.* It is to be hoped that they will be allowed to approximate to the higher figure. Compared to the total national volume of about 2½ thousand million cubic feet of timber, the difference between a generous and a niggardly quota is trifling. If by means of the former enterprise is encouraged, capital attracted, management improved, and replanting secured, the long-term advantage must surely outweigh the short-term risk. Nor must we forget that timber is a crop. When any crop has reached maturity, it is best harvested and the ground freed for fresh growth.

A third matter of importance, and one in which it is satisfactory to be able to record steady progress, is the closely related fields of marketing, scientific research, and technical knowledge: closely related because, unless based on scientific knowledge, new technical processes lack a sure foundation, while the expense of building up large-scale production is to-day so great that, without the assurance of a profitable market, it cannot be justified. In these directions, the State cannot compel, but it can give a lead; and in more directions than one useful developments are

* The quota for 1952 is 26 million cubic feet of hard wood, 7 million cubic feet of soft wood—a total of 33 million cubic feet.

taking place. At the Research Station at Princes Risborough, tests are constantly in progress on new uses for timber, and on the suitability of timbers, both homegrown and imported, for varying purposes. In London, a Utilisation Committee has been set up on which the State, the Trade, and the woodland owner are represented. Under its ægis, a Utilisation Officer and his assistants are engaged in exploring new outlets for British timber. The success of their labours will often be influenced by the enterprise of private individuals such as Mr Jacobs, who, at his sawmill at Chester, is providing new and valuable outlets for the smaller forest products which the scientific thinning of young plantations produces in such abundance. Theoretically, the cure for many marketing difficulties is co-operation; but it must be admitted that, for reasons well understood by students of economics, cooperation whether for buying or selling is a plant of slow growth in Great Britain. In two instances, Northern Forestry Products and the Cooperative Forestry Society of Scotland, successful societies exist. In other directions, the outlook is more uncertain. It is not unreasonable to hope, however, that, as the progress of Dedication adds to the number of small men attempting efficient woodland management, an increasing opening for cooperation will present itself. A development which is cooperative in practice though not in name is the action of a number of the larger timber merchants in undertaking, on a contract basis, the planting up and after-care of woodland areas which they have felled. This helps to solve the problem of the owner who is on too small a scale to keep a fully qualified staff, and is undoubtedly beneficial. Alongside of this, there has been a commendable attempt to speed up woodland turnover by the growing of quickly maturing crops for special markets. Examples of this are the growing of willows for cricket bats, of poplars for the match and chip trade, and of Norway spruce for Christmas trees. All of these, thanks to their comparatively rapid cycle of growth, reduce the long time-lag which is the principal handicap of the timber grower.

To round off our national processing facilities, what is needed, above all, is a series of pulp mills which will provide a use for the timber of almost every description for which no other easy outlet exists. Here, a lightly forested country such as England is involved in a vicious circle: the

enormous through-put of a modern pulp mill and its high capitalisation demand great quantities of timber, yet without such processing facilities already in being sufficiently large forest tracts are hardly likely to be created. At the present moment, at least three such mills are in existence. To make the national position satisfactory, their number should at least be doubled.

A marketing development which promises well for the future is the agreement just concluded between the National Coal Board and the Federated Home Timber Merchants Association, with the backing of woodland owners, for the supply of pit props. This agreement covers the whole of England except the south-west, for which a separate agreement is in course of negotiation. By guaranteeing to the woodland owner a price substantially in advance of two years ago, it goes some way to remove the old grievance that, in the purchase of pit props, the collieries favoured the foreigner at the expense of the British producer. Owners and the Trade, for their part, undertake to do all in their power to expand output, and to ensure a high level of reliability and standardisation. The agreement continues for 12 months; but it is hoped that it will become a permanent feature of our woodland economy. It is hard to exaggerate its importance at a moment when the rapidly maturing woods of the Commission are bound to bring an ever-increasing flow of thinnings on to the market.

Finally, a glimpse into the future. In the opening years of the twenty-first century, if wisdom prevails and mankind has not by then committed nuclear suicide, there should be in Great Britain rather over five million acres of forest, covering approximately 10 per cent. of the area of the country—in acreage perhaps half as large again as our existing woodlands—in productivity many times greater. From this, year by year, perhaps one-third* of our total requirements will be drawn. The biggest increase will be found in the west and north, and here no doubt conifers will predominate. But throughout the country, and particularly in the south and east, deciduous trees will be found in plenty, especially the more quickly maturing

* In the Post-War Forestry Report (Cmd 6447) it is estimated that five million well-managed acres will produce 35 per cent. of our total requirements.

species, in situations suitable for their growth. Nor need we fear that increased efficiency will destroy beauty. The farmer, in the pursuit of his calling, thinks of profit and utility: but the natural processes which he encourages rarely fail to bring beauty in their train. What stands for him, stands also for the forester. The dislike of felling mature timber, which in the minds of some has become almost pathological, is in reality little else than an extreme and irrational form of conservatism. The child, at play on the nursery floor, can brook no interference with his toys. Yet those same bricks and soldiers will be arranged tomorrow night in some new pattern which he will find equally fascinating. So also in the woods. It is astonishing how rapidly, once it has been felled, the memory of some monarch of the forest is forgotten; how quickly new growth takes the place of old; how often thinning and felling reveal new vistas of unexpected charm.

Small our woodlands must ever remain in comparison with the great forests of overseas: but what they lack in size, they may well make good in beauty, in intensiveness, and in the patient skill of those who manage them.

R. G. PROBY.

Art. 10.—CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND.

THE relationship of Church and State is not, for the ordinary English layman of to-day, a problem of great urgency. It is likely indeed that he does not think of it as a problem at all. The real issue, as he sees it, is rather the whole future of Christian institutions in face of a public opinion which shows every evidence of becoming increasingly indifferent to the claims of traditional Christianity in whatever form. It is a judgment which goes to the root of things and is not in the main to be disputed. But questions of the Church's rights and responsibilities in the modern State, the unhampered discharge of its spiritual mission, its freedom to express its faith as and how it will, the appointment of its highest officers, the moral as well as legal authority of the enactments or decisions binding upon its members—these are matters which have a direct bearing on the Church's life, worship and witness, and no seriously minded churchman can remain content to see them shelved. It may be, of course, that lay opinion—especially that which does not find ready articulation in the Diocesan Conferences or the Church Assembly—is still of a largely Erastian colour and is afraid that a Church of England invested with a greater independence is one which is likely to betray—and it would suggest that it has good reason for so thinking—that religious heritage which, whether he much values it nor not, the Englishman ought to be able to continue to look on as his right. At the present moment, happily, tension between the interests of the Church and the prerogatives of the State is not very obvious. But upon this too much should not be built, for there exists no new ground for denying the possibility that an issue might at some time arise in which a clash must prove inevitable. In any case what is involved remains a question of principle of the highest importance when considered in all its bearings. So lately as June 1949, the Church Assembly passed a resolution in which it was stated that 'the Assembly, while valuing the "Establishment" of the Church of England as an expression of the nation's recognition of religion, nevertheless is of opinion that the present form of it impedes the fulfilment of the responsibilities of the Church as a spiritual society.' The upshot has been the appointment by the Assembly of a commission, under the

chairmanship of Sir Walter Moberly, 'to draw up resolutions on changes desirable in the present relation between Church and State,' whose report, notable at any rate for its caution and moderation of statement, has now recently been made public.*

Questions arising from the relationship of Church and State appear to-day in a very different light from that of former ages. 'There is not,' wrote Hooker, 'any man of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England.' The Establishment rested indeed upon this principle; but the principle was open to exception virtually from the moment of its utterance, and the succeeding centuries have all but completely destroyed it. Yet it is not so long since Parliament could, in fact, be held to represent, in a broad way, the lay opinion of the national Church. The House of Commons, as lately as 1927 and 1928, believed itself morally as well as legally competent to debate and vote upon a matter the significance and implications of which were plainly and indisputably spiritual. But there can surely be few now who do not feel also that the Commons' decision was other than a reckless blow at the Church's spiritual autonomy. In modern times the disparity of outlook between the English Church and the English people is too great to be obscured behind a façade of prescriptive right and traditional form. The layman of the Church of England is no longer, alas, the 'man in the street,' and the latter's views cannot provide any reliable rule in the conception and planning of the Church's tasks. Church and State, therefore, are not now distinctive functions of an essential unity. The State is the community as politically organised; and the community, for the most part, when not overtly secular in aims and standards, is Christian only in a vestigial sense.

However, the Church of England's position in regard to the State has become a problem not only for the reasons just noted, but—certainly no less—on account of its recovered apprehension of the age-old continuity and essential independence of its spiritual life and mission. The easy-going complaisance of the Georgian era, the

* 'Church and State.' Church Information Board of the Church Assembly (C.A.1023). 1952. 2s. 6d.

equanimity of which was only a little ruffled by the 'enthusiasm' of Wesley and his followers, at length succumbed before the challenge, first of Evangelicalism, then of the Oxford Movement. The latter, with its outcome in Ritualism or Anglo-Catholicism, has transformed the English Church. Its effects have been all-pervasive, not only in the matter of externals—forms of worship and ceremonial—but in the whole conception of the Church, its nature, calling and function. Among the English clergy Erastianism has now all but vanished. The last thing which the average parish priest considers is that the Church of England—the Catholic Church in this land, as he teaches his confirmation candidates—is an Act of Parliament Church. If he cannot deny certain facts of ecclesiastical history he is also perfectly content to ignore them. The attitude of mind symbolised by the notorious Public Worship Regulation Act he simply will not heed. The clergy as a body have for very many years—and they can count on a strong and not unrepresentative lay following—been convinced that the liturgical provisions of 1662 are too rigid and too narrow to give expression to new spiritual needs, far-reaching developments in theological thought and a radically changed ecclesiastical temper. They have, of course, brought upon themselves the odium of 'lawlessness.' Fifty or sixty years ago the vagaries of the extreme men aroused nation-wide protest, the response to which was the setting up of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, from whose findings sprang the ill-starred attempt to revise the Prayer Book. In the meantime the Church gained a limited freedom of action. Out of the Representative Church Council, formed in 1904, grew the existing National Assembly of the Church of England, for which 'powers in regard to legislation' were granted by the Church of England (Powers) Act of 1919—the so-called Enabling Act. But this, as has been quite correctly said, 'though making a vast improvement in the legislative machinery, was not a new concordat between Church and State. It left the constitutional relations of Church and State substantially unaltered.'* The Act facilitated legislation 'touching matters concerning the Church of England' and has made possible a great deal of necessary work

* 'Church and State.' The Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations between Church and State. 1935. Vol. I., p. 34.

for which Parliamentary time could not have been found, but the fundamentals of the situation remain unchanged. Authority lies still, as formerly, with the Sovereign in Parliament. And the effectiveness of this authority as a means of control was demonstrated up to the hilt by the events of 1927 and 1928.

The difficulties in the contemporary situation turn mainly upon three things: (a) the law of worship, and in connection therewith clergy discipline and the meaning and force of 'canonical obedience'; (b) the ecclesiastical courts and notably the final court of appeal; and (c) the method of appointing bishops. The recent Church Assembly Commission dealt with each of these in turn and has made suggestions which, it is to be hoped, will now at last become the occasion of constructive action. The present state of things has persisted too long, despite the serious and by no means impracticable recommendations of previous commissions, whose work has been largely disregarded and forgotten. 'Throughout our proceedings,' say the authors of the new report, 'we have had in front of us the reports of other Commissions, both Royal and Church Assembly, which have surveyed different parts of our field. We are impressed both by the eminence of their members and by the cogency of their arguments, but we are still more impressed, and most painfully, by the extreme paucity of their practical results.*' If their own work, they somewhat ruefully comment, has only added one more to the 'academic exercises' on their theme which already exist, they will have spent their time very unprofitably. Here indeed is the danger. The perils involved are less those of explosive crises than of sheer inanition.

First, then, as concerns adjustment or revision of the law of worship. There is a practically unanimous opinion in the Church that the Prayer Book of 1662 can no longer be observed to the letter. 'Lawlessness' of some sort, therefore, if the clergy are to make any attempt whatever to meet the need and the spirit of the age, is inevitable. Moreover, within the limits admissible by the Book of 1928 the bishops themselves have officially countenanced and approved it.† Prayer Book revision has in fact taken

* 'Church and State' (1952), p. 69.

† The only deviations which carry statutory authority are those allowed by the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, 1872.

place and changes which have become a feature of nearly every parish church in England cannot now be disallowed. The only thing is for the law to be itself so modified as to admit of those deviations the legitimacy of which rests upon a general consensus of opinion. There must, that is to say, be a law of worship wide enough for modern needs and capable (presumably) of enforcement.* For the crux of the matter is not that there are general divergences from the rigid standards of 1662 but that there are certain extreme developments, commonly denounced as 'Romanising,' for which the Anglican tradition can afford no real sanction.† To the ordinary layman the stone of stumbling is the excesses of a comparative few. On the other hand, the mind of the Church of England being what we know it to-day, it is not possible that an attempt to impose a single pattern of worship should meet with success. The principle of *variation* must itself be allowed, provided that the variations approved are not on doctrinal grounds mutually incompatible in their implications. Within the broad framework of Anglican teaching certain differences of 'use' will have to be permitted.

How, then, can the Church secure freedom to order its *lex orandi* as the needs of the age may demand? To many the granting of such a status of autonomy as that recognised by statute as belonging to the Church of Scotland makes a strong appeal. The fifth Declaratory Article contained in the Schedule of the Church of Scotland Act, 1921,‡ lays it down that 'this Church has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members. . . .' It is incredible that an autonomy which

* Cf. F. A. Iremonger, 'William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters' (1948), p. 347.

† But the 'Romanisers' are not the only offenders. Many Liberal or 'Modernist' churchmen are not innocent in this matter; nor yet are those eclectics who seek to improve the Church's forms of worship by interlarding prayers, culled from a variety of sources, which all too often are quite unsuited for liturgical purposes.

‡ 11 & 12 Geo. 5, c. 29.

is right for the Church of Scotland should in principle be wrong for the Church of England* ; all the same it is generally considered that the 'Scottish solution' would be inapplicable to the latter. The history and conditions of the two communions are so very different that it is altogether unlikely that their relations with the State could take an identical form. Moreover it is one thing to recognise a relationship long existing but another deliberately to create it. What the 1935 Commission recommended was a method of special procedure for 'spiritual' Measures. According to this any Measure as to which the two Archbishops, the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons should have certified their unanimous opinion that it related substantially to the spiritual concerns of the Church of England, and that any civil or secular interests affected thereby might be regarded as negligible, the Archbishops also certifying that it had been approved by resolutions passed by Convocation and twice by the Diocesan Conferences of not less than three-fourths of the dioceses, and that in their opinion it contained nothing contrary to the Church's fundamental doctrines and principles as set forth in its formularies, might forthwith be presented to the King for the Royal Assent. Thus would Parliamentary debate be by-passed.

But the recent Commission felt that this not unattractive proposal would not meet the need to-day. It is argued that it was put forward in 1935 only as a long-term policy and 'subject to conditions very difficult of fulfilment.' Objection is made, in particular, that its acceptance by Parliament would depend upon virtual unanimity of agreement within the Church, and that Parliament would certainly not allow an ecclesiastical majority to coerce a substantial minority. The new suggestion is that power be given to the Church 'to make optional and experimental use of deviations from the forms prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer,' subject to certain safeguards, viz. that the concurrence of the House of Laity should be required before any such deviation is sanctioned by Convocation ; that permission for it should have a time-limit of, say, seven or ten years, renewable only by a fresh decision of Convocation and the House of Laity ; and that no deviation should be sanctioned unless there is a majority in its favour of not less than two-thirds of those present

* 'Church and State' (1935), Vol. I., p. 56.

and voting, both in each of the Houses of Convocation and in the House of Laity.

This is the maximum of caution. The objective of a permanent revision of the Prayer Book, with statutory authority, appears to have been postponed *sine die*, while the principle of permitted variations is so hedged around with safeguards as to raise doubt whether the deviations which do procure the necessary sanction would, in fact, come anywhere near to meeting the requirements of the Anglo-Catholics. Yet if it fails to do that, just how far should we have progressed towards the elimination of 'lawlessness'? In any case, although some real meaning might thus provisionally be given to the phrase, 'except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority,' the ultimate control of Parliament would remain. The difficulty for many minds, however, is whether a purely secular body—for the operative factor would still be the vote of the House of Commons—ought to have such power of veto at all in matters spiritual. If, moreover, it were fairly certain to be used, unless Parliament were confronted with almost complete unanimity on the part of the Church, where indeed is the latter's spiritual autonomy? More than once in the history of the Christian Church vital decisions have had to be taken in spite of a large, clamant and powerfully influential minority. But the essence of liberty is that such decisions, controverted though they be, are yet possible. The Church of England being what it is (and, surely, always has been) general agreement on either doctrine or ritual seems hardly conceivable. The objection that the Church's freedom should be 'of right' and not merely 'of grace' is not to be dismissed as doctrinaire. A principle is involved which might one day, if disregarded, have grave consequences.

Assuming, however, that a satisfactory law is devised, what means are there for its enforcement? Thus arises the question of the ecclesiastical courts, and more particularly of the final court of appeal, which, since 1832, when the old Court of Delegates was abolished, has been the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.* The plain fact is that the ecclesiastical courts have lost authority for the very reason that appeal is ultimately to a court which in the eyes of the clergy and the more conscientious

* Actually since 1833. Appellate jurisdiction was at first vested in the Privy Council as a whole.

laity lacks both competence and moral authority. That the Judicial Committee is composed of legal personalities with the highest qualifications is not disputed. But that it is in any way fitted to pronounce authoritatively upon matters of doctrine or ritual is a claim now altogether unacceptable. Its members are not theologians nor has their appointment any relationship to their standing (if any) in the Church. The Committee's episcopal assessors are present only at public hearings, possess no vote and are not responsible for the judgments delivered. The consequence has been that the Judicial Committee has simply ceased to function as an ecclesiastical court and its findings in previous cases have lost what credit they ever had. Obviously this state of affairs cries out for remedy; for the effectiveness of ecclesiastical law must in part at all events depend upon the effectiveness of the means for its interpretation and enforcement.

The existing situation is not new. The problem had been recognised as serious back in the eighties of the last century, when a Royal Commission was set up to investigate the constitution and authority of the courts ecclesiastical. The Commission's proposals, submitted in its report (1883), were subsequently adopted (with certain additions thereto) by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, whose own findings were endorsed, twenty years later, by a Commission of the Church Assembly.* The whole subject was reviewed by the Archbishops' Commission on Church and State in 1935, which, however, arrived at a different practical conclusion; while yet more recently (1947) fresh recommendations were made by the Commission on Canon Law. It is these last which have been accepted by the 1952 Commission. It is now suggested that the appellate jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee be altogether abolished, its place to be taken by a new court constituted on the lines recommended in Draft Canon CXII (1947), its membership consisting of the two Archbishops (or, in the event of either of them being unable or unwilling to act, a member of the Upper House of his province), together with two communicant members of the Church of England who hold or who have held high judicial office, the president of the court being one of their own members elected by themselves. It is also recom-

* *Vide* 'Church and State' (1935), Vol. I., Appendix IV. (pp. 139-167), where it is reprinted.

mended that in order that this court might have full ecclesiastical authority its constitution should be laid down by Canon before its presentation as a Measure to Parliament. Of the lower courts nothing is said, in view of the recent appointment of a separate Committee on Church Courts.

After such prolonged, earnest and learned discussion as the findings of all these bodies represent it is to be hoped that the grounds of dissatisfaction so consistently urged, will at last, and without much more delay, be removed.

The third matter is the appointment of bishops. The existing method is very difficult to justify in principle. 'The State'—in the words of the Archbishop of York—'takes the initiative and then, step by step, carries it through by missives, mandates, threats, until the Church has accomplished its bidding and its nominee is duly confirmed and consecrated.'* Or, as the new report puts it, 'it is an obvious anomaly that the chief officers of one society should be appointed by the chief officers of another.'† The *congé d'élire* is no better than a solemn farce. Furthermore, the Prime Minister, as so often has been said, may not be a churchman nor even a Christian. He has a power to exercise his choice pretty much as he likes, the only final means of protest left to the Archbishop being the extreme step of refusal to consecrate. It could happen that a prejudiced and self-willed Prime Minister might nominate a series of unsuitable men whose unsuitability was not yet so patent that refusal to consecrate should become an imperative duty, whatever the consequences. But quite apart from considerations of this kind, where admittedly such a contingency is remote, it is often stressed that the present method 'destroys the moral authority of the episcopate, who are not felt to be, and perhaps do not feel themselves to be, the choice of the Church, and therefore clothed with unquestionable spiritual authority.'‡ On the other hand it is certainly true that it need not work unsatisfactorily and for many years past has not done so. Modern Prime Ministers have clearly bestowed the greatest care and attention upon episcopal appointments and such as may be called 'unfortunate'

* 'Church and State in England' (1950), pp. 196-97.

† 'Church and State' (1952), p. 34.

‡ So Lord Quickwood, in evidence given before the Archbishops' Commission, 1935 (Vol. II., p. 11).

have been very rare indeed. It is known also that the Archbishop of Canterbury is able to exert an influence of commanding force. Archbishop Davidson's method, for example, has been described by his biographer. 'The two general impressions left on the mind,' says Dr Bell, 'after reading the extensive correspondence covering this quarter of a century (i.e. the years of Davidson's Primacy) are, first, that though like other human beings they might not always succeed, Prime Minister and Archbishop both did their very best to find the most suitable men for the Bench of Bishops; and, second, that the Archbishop exercised a predominant influence upon the character of the Bench.'* It is understood that these statements would be not less applicable to the more recent Primacies. But if the Archbishop of Canterbury has this effective influence it cannot fairly be maintained that the bishops are merely foisted on the Church of England and that the clergy ought to be thankful that their spiritual overlords have in fact not proved worse!† All the same it is clear that the Archbishop's advice is not a constitutional right and that the Prime Minister is in no way bound to accept it when offered, nor yet, in strictness, even to seek it.

Various suggestions have been made for improving the method by safeguarding the interests both of Church and State: e.g. that either State or Church, according to whether the right of nomination should lie with the one or the other, would retain a power of veto; but we may agree with the conclusion of the Commission (endorsing that of a 1938 Joint Committee of the Canterbury Convocation on the Appointment of Bishops) that it would be unrealistic, so long as the Establishment remains substantially what it is at present, to expect any formal statutory diminution of the powers of the Crown. Also, they hold that the substitution of a formal voice for the present informal one might have the effect of limiting the Church's actual freedom in recommending suitable men. They conclude, therefore, that 'the part of wisdom is to retain existing forms of procedure as far as possible' and that the rôle of the Church should continue to be advisory only. The Commission's view is that there should be no attempt to diminish the personal responsibility of the Prime

* G. K. A. Bell, 'Randall Davidson,' 2nd ed., 1938, p. 1238.

† It is worth, however, remarking the general disinclination on the part of the clergy to see any increase in the bishops' powers.

Minister for the advice he gives the Sovereign, and that, similarly, final responsibility for the advice to the Prime Minister should remain with the Archbishops. But they add that 'the hands of the Archbishops might be strengthened . . . if they had the means of speaking in the name of the Church rather more authoritatively than at present.' Accordingly, it is suggested that a small consultative body, representing bishops, clergy and laity, might be appointed by the Church Assembly, but responsible solely to the Archbishops. It is further suggested, in order to give some shadow of reality to the *congé d'élire*, that when occasion arises, representatives of the diocese concerned (one of whom would also represent the Chapter) should be invited by the Archbishops to confer with the advisory body, and that Chapters should also exercise their ancient right of *petitioning* for the Royal Licence and thus provide an opportunity 'to make representations to the Crown as to the general needs of the diocese and the type of Bishop required.'*

Again, these proposals are of unexceptionable moderation, yet more thorough-going reform would almost certainly prove incompatible with Establishment, under which the right of appointment must rest with the Crown. Ought not, then—some will say—the Establishment itself to be ended? They contend indeed that not until this is brought about will the Church have any real and untrammelled freedom to order its life and worship in accordance with its principles and teaching, without resort to diplomatic adjustments of one kind or another with a civil authority which is becoming ever less representative not only of the Church of England but of Christianity itself. This position had its most eloquent and forceful advocate in the late Bishop Hensley Henson, whose words, re-read to-day, seem to lose nothing of their persuasive power. But it is generally agreed that the case against Disestablishment, although it has to be argued circumstantially, is very strong. It has been well summarised by Mr T. S. Eliot. 'An Established Church,' he says, 'is exposed to peculiar temptations and compulsions; it has greater advantages and greater difficulties. But we must pause to reflect that a Church, once disestablished, cannot easily be re-established, and that the very act of disestablishment separates it more definitely and irrevocably from the life

* 'Church and State' (1952), p. 64.

of the nation than if it had never been established. The effect in the mind of the people of the visible and dramatic withdrawal of the Church from the affairs of the nation, of the deliberate recognition of two standards and ways of life, of the Church's abandonment of all those who are not by their whole-hearted profession within the fold—this is incalculable; the risks are so great that such an act can be nothing but a desperate measure. . . . Disestablishment, instead of being the *recognition* of a condition at which we have arrived, would be the *creation* of a condition the results of which we cannot foresee.* Moreover, it must not be forgotten 'that to many the Establishment is the symbol of the official acceptance of Christianity as the national religion, and that if England, by Disestablishment, should seem to become neutral in the fight between faith and unfaith in Christianity, that would be a calamity for our people, and indeed, for the whole world.'† This is no exaggeration. Should such circumstances ever arise that the Church's spiritual freedom *must* depend upon complete repudiation of the State connection then Disestablishment would be the only way. But mercifully those circumstances have not yet arisen. In any case, Disestablishment, the terms of which might impose upon the Church a severe handicap—and that not only in regard to temporalities—would have to be an act of the State and not of the Church. And the Church has other and more pressing duties before it than to invite so drastic a reconstitution as would absorb its energies for years to come.

The recent report is a modest, reasonable document, unlikely, as it seems, to excite any lively controversial discussion either within the Church or without. On appearance the press accorded it a suitable degree of publicity but could find no startling headline. Provided that it does not merely follow its predecessors (and, unfortunately, so many other admirable Church statements on all manner of subjects) into oblivion, something of constructive good may ere long be done towards improving the position of the national Church. Uncompromising zeal may well yield a lesser benefit than the quiet endeavour of meliorist reform.

B. M. G. REARDON.

* 'The Idea of a Christian Society' (1939), p. 49.

† 'Church and State' (1935), Vol. I., p. 49.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Lord Randolph Churchill.** Winston S. Churchill.
The Victorian Temper. Jerome Hamilton Buckley.
Russia Absent and Present. Wladimir Weidlé.
The Making of France. Marie Madeleine Martin.
Power Politics. Dr Georg Schwarzenberger.
The Forging of a Family. Lord Geddes.
Community Farm. John Middleton Murry.
The Great Philosophers: The Eastern World. E. W. F. Tomlin.
The Beauty of Old Trains. Hamilton Ellis.
How the Civil Service Works. Bosworth Monek.
The Confident Years, 1885-1915. Van Wyck Brooks.
The Story of Language. Dr Mario Pei.
Beginning in Archæology. Kathleen M. Kenyon.
The Last Serjeant. A. M. Sullivan, Q.C.
The Sensations, Their Functions, Processes and Mechanisms. Dr Henri Piéron.
Poems 1914-1950. Edward B. Powley.
The World of Learning, 1952. Europa Publications, Ltd.

A NEW one-volume edition of 'Lord Randolph Churchill,' by Winston S. Churchill, is very welcome, and Messrs Odhams are to be congratulated on producing one—all 850 pages of it—at the reasonable price of a guinea. The book is of course one of the outstanding biographies of the present century, both for the interest of the subject and for the skill and eminence of the author. Lord Randolph's rise in the early 1880s was almost meteor-like. From being an ordinary backbench member he rose in a few years to be Leader of the House of Commons and Chancellor of the Exchequer when only thirty-six. His resignation and fall were equally meteor-like, sudden and complete. He thought himself indispensable and so able to enforce his views on his Cabinet colleagues. He was wrong and he paid the price. He was often in things political a 'hard man, reaping where he had not sown, severe to exact service and obedience, hasty in judgement, fierce in combat: and many a black look or impatient word had been remembered against him by those of whose existence he was perhaps scarcely conscious. Friends he had in plenty—some of them true ones; but for all the personal charm, which he could exert at will, his manner had added to his enemies.' Tory democracy owes a great debt to him, and it might have been much greater but for his own impatience and autocratic temper. And then

illness prevented any return to the heights. It is a moving story, a tragedy finely told.

United States literary criticism inclines to analysis rather than synthesis. Mr Jerome Hamilton Buckley entitles his 'study in literary culture' '**The Victorian Temper**' (George Allen and Unwin), yet devotes his first chapter to proving that 'Victorianism' never existed, being merely 'an Edwardian myth.' He disarms criticism by saying that he has chosen 'a relatively few centres of literary influence,' Carlyle, Tennyson, Kingsley, Ruskin, and Oscar Wilde: their inequality of literary status is perplexing. Chapter two deals with the Anti-Romantics, of which, oddly enough, Browning is posed as an example. Chapter three covers the Spasmodic School, Sydney Dobell, Philip James Bailey, Henry Taylor, Alexander Smith, and others whom W. E. Aytoun parodied almost out of existence a hundred years ago. All this leads to the *Æsthetic Eighties*, of which the author makes too much; Wilde, Rossetti, John Davidson, Crackenthorpe, Dowson, Lionel Johnson, Le Gallienne, Beardsley, and other coterie writers of the Yellow Book period who won a noisy but ephemeral fame. Mr Buckley's last chapter deals with the Decadents and After: if our fathers had to put up with the Decadents, we have been encumbered with the 'After.' Painting is of course touched upon; including the Pre-Raphaelites, Frith, Whistler, and Landseer. Some of the author's *obiter dicta* are worth while, but he merely pays tribute to a popular fallacy when he speaks of 'the incalculable evils of economic inequality.' '**The Victorian Temper**' might not unfairly be described as a map without contours.

Every journalist who writes about Russia, still more every politician who speaks about Russia, should be made first to pass an examination in '**Russia Absent and Present**,' by Wladimir Weidlé, translated by A. Gordon Smith (Hollis and Carter). This is not to proclaim the book without blemish. A serious criticism is that the author persistently seeks an underlying synthesis by which to explain historical developments and in doing so often overlooks or underestimates obvious facts that were their causes: such, for instance, as the lasting hostility between the Orthodox and the Catholic Churches from which sprang the whole trend of Russian and Polish

relations ; the importance of the Tartar invasion in blocking for three centuries all social or economic progress in Russia, for this blighted growth of a national sense in Russians created the prodigious gap between educated and non-educated man when western ideas began to pour into the country in the nineteenth century ; and the sluggish effect of Russia's distance from the vivifying sea. The author's metaphysical tendency makes his last section, *The Russian Soul*, of less value than other parts of the book, and his observation is better than his philosophy. But, this once admitted, the fact remains that '*Russia Absent and Present*' is the most important essay on Russian history from Rurik to Lenin that has appeared. Though one may disagree with some of Mr Weidlé's opinions, his views on matters of fact would mostly be difficult to contest, and his judgments on recent Russia, especially on Lenin's position and the real objects of Soviet Communism, which he shows to be not Communism at all in the older meaning of the word, but despotism flowering out of destruction, are uncommonly sure. 'Thought,' he says of Soviet Russia, 'is prohibited ; for it is a prohibition of thought to permit it to exist only in a casuistic form in which all the principles are known in advance.' The account of Russia's economic growth in the last period of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth, and of the high level of Russian culture existing then, is excellent. He is perhaps the first competent authority to give their right place to the land reforms of Stolypin, which resulted in 20 per cent. of the peasants in rural communes becoming landowning farmers. 'Anticulture' is his word for the state to which Communism has reduced the once inspiring Russian mind. The following sentence may serve as the summing up of this brilliant book : 'The real problem for Russia, thirty years after the revolution, is not primarily political : it is the problem of her spiritual existence and *therefore* of the régime that can make her spiritual existence again possible.'

'*The Making of France*,' by Marie Madeleine Martin, translated by Barbara and Robert North (Eyre and Spottiswoode) is the first book by a woman historian to be awarded the *Grand Prix d'Histoire de l'Académie Française*, a notable honour, very well deserved. It is a study of the forging of French unity, from the time of the disintegration

of the Roman province of Gaul to its apotheosis under Louis XIV with some later chapters of a more controversial and less impartial nature on developments since. France is not the result of natural boundaries marking out territory as a geographic unit. It is the result of the process of cohesion and separation of the splintered portions of the Roman province, gradually being concentrated under monarchic rule. In this the Capetian dynasty played a notable part, and the king became the centre round which the life of the country revolved. Then the eighteenth-century philosophers, putting forward abstract conceptions of the state and patriotism, destroyed the figure on which the former patriotism had depended. This really bred the ideas of the Revolution, while Napoleon, trying to unify an enlarged France by overrunning neighbouring countries, unwillingly fostered the spirit of nationalism from which the world has suffered so much of late years. The Church, too, through the centuries has played a part in the making of France which was sometimes of the greatest importance, though sometimes disruptive. This is a remarkable book which will repay close study.

It is possible only roughly to indicate the exhaustiveness of the second revised edition of Dr Georg Schwarzenberger's '**Power Politics**': a study of International Society (Stevens). Conveniently divided into three parts entitled *Elements of Power Politics*, *Power Politics in Disguise*, and *Conditions of International Order*, it has a general, and a specialised, bibliography and a moderately useful index. Although the author maintains a considerable measure of objectivity, certain invalid assumptions undermine the value of his scholarship, labour, and idealism. A cynic might not find it difficult to maintain that all politics are Power Politics in disguise. If, like the League of Nations, the United Nations is a failure, why not face the facts? The innumerable international bodies now so fashionable are largely propaganda agencies—null and void. The Atlantic Union seems unable to get form. Most of the smaller nations are what the Americans call 'Joiners'; few have the will, or the power, to pay even a small annual subscription. Stalin, that supreme realist, said at Yalta: 'The Conference of the Big Three is a very exclusive club, the entrance fee being at least five million

soldiers, or the equivalent.' Having no need to flatter voters he is not obliged to prattle about such non-existent things as democracy and equality. Dr Schwarzenberger's quotation from Vattel's 'Droit des Sens' was never true: a dwarf is not 'as much a man as a giant.' The pretence that all states are sovereign and equal is as pernicious as the make-believe that all men are sovereign and equal. But the author's most dangerous fallacy is the repeated assumption that there is such a thing as 'the science of international relations'! Science deals only with ascertained facts; politics with the dubious ambitions and selfish hopes of fallible humanity.

Although the 'sporting gent' is aggressively ignorant of the word genetics and has never read Galton's 'Natural Inheritance,' he, as a keen student of heredity and form, might read '**The Forging of a Family**,' by Auckland Campbell, Lord Geddes (Faber and Faber), with interest. Geddes, who won distinction in medicine, government, the army, business, diplomacy, and politics, was faced at the age of seventy with the necessity to re-create his life. An almost incredible series of accidents and illnesses, including the loss of one eye and injury to the other, culminated with a buzz bomb catching him in his garden in Kent when, as he puts it, he was 'left to play his new part, sans sex, sans sight.' One might say sans everything save superb courage. Always interested in genetics, the blind man set himself the congenial and fruitful task of compiling from rich material a history of the Geddes family over seven generations, or some 315 years. Deeply rooted in Orkney and Scotland the clan spread far and wide, the original virile stock being enriched generation after generation by marriages with the Mackays, Andersons, Cruickshanks, Campbells, and many more. The Geddes women, so born and by marriage, were never mediocre, and from Granny o' Hoy, c. 1727, to Mrs Douglas Chalmers-Watson, first woman M.D. of Edinburgh University and first Comptroller of the W.A.A.C., many were remarkable. What was, seemingly, disaster set Lord Geddes free: 'the blinded man learns to think, to sit still and listen.' Without question the finest part of a family history that will endure is 'Testament at Seventy' where a lonely man, at last, comes face to face with God. The experience, and the clarity with which it is set forth, places the author

amongst the incomparable brotherhood of the great mystics.

'**Community Farm,**' by John Middleton Murry (Peter Nevill), is the story of the author's valiant attempt to restore to prosperity a more or less derelict farm and work it with a team of socialist-pacifist-conscientious objectors, beginning in 1942. It was soon evident that love of the land was for many of the team only an escape from military service, while their community ideologies were largely shown by intense individualism as far as their own comforts and careers were concerned. They declined to discuss such mundane things as money and capital, always provided that someone (in this case the author) supplied it to meet all their wants, claimed no rights in doing so and expected no gratitude. This team steadily disintegrated and then Mr Murry sensibly took to normal wage-earning countrybred landworkers, and at last after years of hard work, foresight and prudent use of capital the farm turned the corner and showed a profit. The book has two special interests, firstly the absorbing work of restoring a derelict farm and secondly the opportunity given to so skilled an author to depict his peculiar team, which he does with remarkable frankness and discernment, and, one would imagine, with no great pleasure for those depicted, except in the case of the genuine landworkers, who are rightly praised. Mr Murry must be a man of exemplary patience and he has written a book of very rich value and interest.

Mr E. W. F. Tomlin has followed up his popular study 'The Great Philosophers: The Western World' with a companion volume: '**The Great Philosophers: The Eastern World**' (Skeffington). It is even more interesting than its predecessor because it covers more untrodden ground. If politicians had even a superficial knowledge of the best thought of ancient Egypt, Babylonia, and Persia it might help them to resolve contemporary problems. Beginning with the Egyptian Ptah, the Sun God of Memphis, and including Zarathustra, Buddha, Mohammed, Leo-Tze, Confucius, and Ramakrishna, the author covers more than adequately an extraordinary amount of ground. His style is simple, direct, and very readable. Reminding us that all the perfect religions (including Christianity), and all the perfect Teachers came from the

East, Mr Tomlin insists on the remarkable unity underlying all their diversities. In this fact lies a germ of hope for the ultimate unity of East and West. The author may, or may not, be justified in the assumption that Buddha and Mohammed probably could not read or write; he is surely wrong in including Christ. Jesus Christ spoke Aramaic, Greek, Hebrew, and Latin; indeed, without them his public mission would have been impossible. He was master of an incomparably beautiful, yet popular, style, and no one can be master of a language that he does not both write and speak. As Mr Tomlin truly says, if we are to understand, we must not only read but assimilate. His own simple style will encourage one and facilitate the other.

'The Beauty of Old Trains,' by Hamilton Ellis (Allen and Unwin), will bring nostalgic pleasure to many railway lovers, especially to the more erudite, as some of the more technical terms used with regard to engines will leave the general reader somewhat bewildered, however much he (or she) may enjoy this remembrance of trains long ago. Before 1923 there were over a hundred separate railways, displaying an attractive variety of colours of engines and carriages, as well as definite individual characteristics. How dull now are the all-pervading British Railways and standardised stock. Gone is the pleasure of train spotting in places like Carlisle or York when trains of five or six railways might be marked down all in the same station. Mr Ellis with his customary skill and enthusiasm deals with many aspects of the subject: expresses and locals, the train in the landscape, 'Pomp and Circumstance' in later Victorian and Edwardian times, light railways, oddities, engine names, foreign influences, etc., and there are eight of his own delightful sketches in colour and many half-tones.

'How the Civil Service Works,' by Bosworth Monck (Phoenix House), is a most useful book, giving in little over 250 pages a remarkable amount of information about not only the Civil Service but also the whole machinery of government. The author's expressed aim is to provide an account of some of the methods by which Great Britain is governed, and the particular responsibilities of the major departments of the state. In the first half of the book we are told about the Civil Service in general, who work in it and how they qualify for it, then we are told about the

processes of government and how it pays its way and the relation between the Civil Service personnel and the government of the day. In the second half of the book twenty-five of the Government Departments are brought under review and we are shown how they are organised and how they work. We are also told how the private citizen can use Parliament and other organs of government to check the state's power over him. We are told of the 'unpleasant disease aptly called private secretaryitis, a symptom of which is being haughty, usually on the telephone, to anyone meek or diffident.' That is only an aside—the whole, including reasonable criticism of some methods, is a fine tribute to a great and rightly praised Service, and the story is told with skill and discernment.

'**The Confident Years, 1885-1915,**' by Van Wyck Brooks (Dent), concludes the remarkable series of works by the author entitled 'Makers and Finders,' a History of the Writer in America 1800-1915, covering American literature in that period and including among others two deservedly praised volumes 'The World of Washington Irving' and 'The Flowering of New England.' The first reaction of a reader in this country may well be surprise at the large number of authors dealt with, and the second reaction may be his regrettable but complete ignorance of most of them. Of course Henry Adams, George Cable, Fenimore Cooper, Stephen Crane, R. H. Davies, Theodore Dreiser, R. W. Emerson, Henry Harland, N. Hawthorne, Ernest Hemingway, W. D. Howells, Vachel Lindsay, Jack London, Frank Norris, Ezra Pound, Theodore Roosevelt, Gertrude Stein, Booth Tarkington, Mark Twain, Edith Wharton, and others are well known on this side of the Atlantic, but they are but a small minority in this crowded scene. Mr Brooks treats his subject chronologically and geographically—New York, Chicago, San Francisco, the west, south, and east. He deals with the careers of many authors and follows some to Europe. He has an interesting final survey, 'A forward glance,' and the whole is written with his accustomed skill and will reward study—though it must be concentrated to get full benefit.

Dr Mario Pei in '**The Story of Language**' (George Allen and Unwin), displays knowledge, industry, and fluency, but it cannot be said of him that, like Archbishop Trench in 'English Past and Present,' he displays 'an

exquisite literary taste.' His basic weakness is that he shares the vulgar dislike of using the proper word English and is, therefore, forced to substitute such bastard neologisms as British English and American English. Equally distorting is the fact that the United States are by no means America. Dr Pei rightly discards such suggested abominations as 'Messian,' 'Usian,' 'Usonian,' and 'Unisian,' declaring that 'none of them took'; but why does he reject 'Unitedstatish' language yet speak of the equally mythical 'British' language? That he is not fastidious is shown by his acceptance of such words as 'penult,' 'concretizing,' and such terms as 'figure out' and 'utterly fails to exist.' There never was a period when means of communication between human beings were so perfect, or understanding between them more imperfect. Therefore Dr Pei's racy story is welcome. He has divided it into six Parts: History of Language, Constituent Elements, Social Function, Modern Spoken Tongues, Problems of Language, and An International Language—of which he is an enthusiastic advocate. He considers that, if properly outlined in the 1950's, a standardised 'interlanguage' would be 'a living, powerful reality by A.D. 2050.' Dr Pei quotes an apposite Russian proverb: The Russian is strong on three foundations—'perhaps,' 'never mind,' and 'somehow.'

'**Beginning in Archæology,**' by Kathleen M. Kenyon (Phoenix House), fulfils excellently the purpose suggested by its title and will be of great use to keen students. It begins with a clear explanation of the meaning and framework of archæology and how to become an archæologist. Then it turns to field work, excavating, recording, and dealing with finds. It also gives useful information about field surveys and air photography, and in addition details of opportunities of archæological training in the Universities, of British Schools of Archæology and of archæological posts and societies. Miss Kenyon writes with authority as lecturer and former secretary of the London University Institute of Archæology and she has had intensive practical experience of digging both in this country and in the Near East. She does not minimise the hard work and difficulties, but her enthusiasm will carry students on to explore for themselves how man in early ages lived and what his domestic surroundings were like.

'The Last Serjeant,' by A. M. Sullivan, Q.C., with a preface by Lord Jowitt, lately Lord Chancellor (Methuen), is an entertaining and illuminating book, but it might be asked what was the author's aim in writing it. It seems unlikely that it was deliberately to discredit and ridicule the whole system of law in Ireland during the last quarter of the last century and the first of the present one, but that is the effect. Peculiarity and eccentricity began on the Judge's Bench, it seems, and pervaded the whole court, and they do not seem to have been redeemed by impartiality. In lower courts many of the justices seem to have been flagrantly venal, and perjury among witnesses was open and unashamed. Political considerations blocked the whole course of justice, and to them were often added violence and corruption. Presumably even in Ireland the Courts must sometimes have been carried on with dignity and propriety, but there is but little sign of this in Serjeant Sullivan's book. There are many amusing stories, some perhaps not as lucid as they might be, though many worthy of books like 'Some Experiences of an Irish R.M.,' but hardly suitable in such full measure from an eminent lawyer dealing with his experience of the Law.

All a layman should attempt to do with a work of high scientific consequence is to call attention to it with respect, indicate the importance of the authorship and the compass of the contents. The title-page of '**The Sensations, Their Functions, Processes and Mechanisms**' (Frederick Muller), bears the names of Henri Piéron, Professor of the Physiology of Sensation, Collège de France, Paris, as author, with M. H. Pirenne, Dr.Sc. (Liège), Ph.D. (Cantab), and Lecturer in Physiology Marischal College, Aberdeen, and B. C. Abbott of the Biophysics Research Unit of the University of London, as translators. This is the English edition, largely revised and brought up to date, of an important work published in Paris in 1945. A work of synthesis, the outcome of some thirty years of research. The English edition is divided into four main parts with numerous sub-divisions; the four are: From the Stimulus to the Sensation, Problem of the Excitation Mechanisms, Basis of Qualitative Appreciations, and Basis of Quantitative Appreciations (to which there are six sub-divisions). The keynote of the study—

given as the author's introduction—is: Suppose a child could possibly come into the world deprived of all the different pathways which bring to his nervous centres the indications given by the sensitive organs distributed throughout his body . . . what would become of the child? That simplicity of style has, as far as was practicable, been preserved throughout. The Conclusion, Bibliography, Supplement to the Bibliography, Index of Authors, and Index of Subjects are worthy of a text-book that will for long occupy an important place in University teaching; while, read carefully, the Conclusion will be grasped by anyone of average intelligence.

The fitting of poetic ideas into strict poetic form is not nowadays a craft that has the blessing of the modern critic-practitioner. An idea prised with great labour from the clay of the subconscious is only too often as rough as a flint nodule and as oddly shaped, and yet it is offered as if mineral virginity were an ultimate virtue. Edward B. Powley in his '*Poems 1914-1950*' (Frederick Muller) has kept strictly to poetic form: in his early poems to the 'vacation' enthusiasm and detailed praise of place of the Georgians; in his later work to a more rugged style and theme which, in view of his poems dealing with Thomas Hardy, can be attributed to the influence of that master. Mr Powley in his nature poems sometimes achieves a real freshness of communication that is always tied down to positive things of the natural world and is pleasantly free of the inherited poetic images that turn the praise of Nature into immemorial platitude. Many of his poems have to do with his reactions to historical events, but these have little to give in the way of vision, and too often he expresses them in expected clichés. But with his tendency to moralise goes much good firm phraseology and, though without sustained originality, some striking expressiveness, of which 'the velveties of dark' is a good example.

Works of reference are the standby of students, editors, authors, and business men. Europa Publications Ltd. are public benefactors with their series of such works. They have now issued '*The World of Learning, 1952*,' giving nearly a thousand pages of useful information. A large section is devoted to UNESCO, giving an account of its origins, aims, functions, and organisations. This will be

helpful for students, though the general public, we fear, does not take as much interest in UNESCO as it well might. Then the volume gives a detailed list of the principal international scientific and cultural organisations in no less than seventy-four countries all over the world. This is really a remarkable achievement. Information is also given in all these countries about academies, learned societies, libraries, archives, museums, art galleries, universities, colleges, and technical institutes, with their addresses, officials, etc., and other supplementary details. To review such a work in any literary sense is obviously impossible, but to recommend its use and acquisition is easy and very well deserved. On all pages some useful information is given and congratulations are due to the editors for their thoroughness and comprehensiveness.

STUTLEY

GREEN

STORIES

The Negro

and The Negro

These are two very different stories, but they are both about the Negro. The first is a story of a Negro who is a member of a white family, and the second is a story of a Negro who is a member of a Negro family. Both stories are told in a simple, direct, and powerful way, and they are both very moving and illuminating.

12c.

STUTLEY

The Negro in America

This is a book about the Negro in America. It tells the story of his life, from his early years in Africa to his present life in America. It is a book that is both informative and moving, and it is a book that is very well written.

Program of the nation, and it is a book that would never forget a tale of great interest. --The New York Times

12c.

JOHN MURRAY

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor

Chap. Editor